

~~BAP~~
R189p

Principles of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.


SCB

10297









Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

6
P H I L A L E T H E S

A G A I N !

O R,

CANDIDUS unmasked!

Being the SECOND PART of

The humble Attempt of a LAYMAN

T O W A R D S

A Confutation of Mr. HENRY MAYO'S
Pamphlet on Baptism.

Thomas Randall

JOB xxxii, 17, I said I will answer also my Part, I also
will shew mine Opinion,

JOB xl, 5, Once have I spoken ; but I will not answer ;
yea twice ; but I will proceed no farther.

PROV. xxiii, 23, Buy the Truth.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED. Sold by F. BLYTH, in *Cornhill* ; G. KEITH,
in *Grace-Church-street* ; and J. JOHNSON, in *Pater-*
Noster-Row. MDCCLXVII.

[Price One Shilling.]

Monthly Review for Jan 7/1768
Vol 38 page 79 -

In our review for March last,
we made some mention of the
Laymans "Humble Attempt" &
we then sufficiently intimated,
though not in very serious terms,
our disapprobation of the illiberal
manner in which these champions
for and against infant baptism
have carried on their controversy.
The battle however still rages with
the same heat; so that one would
think fire rather than water
was the subject of their animosity
and that they were naturally
excited to choler by the element
they were contending about—
Strange—that people should be
so unceremonious with each
other in a debate merely con-
—cerning a ceremony! & stranger
still as Virgil exclaims, that
such fury should rage in such
heavenly minds! That so, it is,
and so it will be notwithstanding
all the admonitions the Reviewers
have bestowed or may bestow on
the graceless disputants who

they are opposed by *little* ones. I farther flatter myself, that the same heroic magnanimity which hath hitherto forced you to overlook my *writings*, should likewise prevail upon you to overlook my *character*. Reproach is no argument; or, at least, it is a very superfluous one, where reason can exert her voice. You have moreover read that, *the servant of the Lord should not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, and patient*. If, therefore, you think it beneath you to reply to what I have *written*, you should think it equally beneath you to concern yourself with what I have *said or done* in private:—especially if you recollect (as you ought to do) that we long corresponded together as friends and fellow-christians, even after those inadvertencies, or whatever else you may please to call them, for which (unless I am greatly misinformed) you have lately reflected upon me with such unsparing severity. As to the motive of my former publication, that was not, as you have *prudently* represented it, an old grudge, but a regard to truth and common-sense:

for

D E D I C A T I O N. v

for, you may assure yourself, that I had seen your pamphlet advertised several months before it fell into my hands;—and, after all, I met with it not by purchase but mere accident. If, therefore, I could take the pleasure you would insinuate, in mortifying, or endeavouring to mortify my *quondam* friend, I should certainly have purchased one of your books as soon as published, and, if I thought myself capable, have gone to work with it without delay.

I must beg leave to inform you farther, that since my last, I have seen the *Lay-preacher*, whose prayer you have so severely censured in page 36, who assured me, that by the *blind Sodomites groping in the dark*,* &c. he was so far from meaning *sprinkled christians*, that he intended those,—all those, and *only* those, of whatever party or denomination, who are unregenerate, and strangers to the grace of God. It surprised me, that Mr. *Mayo* should be capable of such an ungenerous misrepresentation!

* Deut. xxviii, 29. Job. v, 14. Isaiah lix, 10.

sentation ! And more, that instead of lifting up his heart to God, in that sacred and awful duty of public prayer, he could employ himself in criticizing on the language of the speaker. A fine example from a *christian minister* ! It seems, however, at first you was somewhat diffident of his meaning. “ Sprinkled christians,” say you, in a news-paper, “ *some thought* “ he meant ;” but in your pamphlet you appear to be *certain of it*. O *prejudice*, how powerful is your influence ! Nevertheless the worthy *Lay-preacher* is ready to forgive you, and to excuse you, on account of the heat of youth, and the warmth of opposition. He was once a Pædobaptist himself, and a strenuous one, and still esteems many of them, and is esteemed by them with whose acquaintance he is honoured. I must, however, inform you, that notwithstanding the bad grammar you have charged him with, he is scholar enough to admire the grammar of your *Risum teneatis Amice*. He owns, indeed, thrt *teneatis* should have been of the singular number, to agree with *Amice* ;
but

D E D I C A T I O N. vii

but this, he supposes, would have spoiled the metre you intended.

All I have farther to say, is to compliment you on the many strokes of mirth with which you have enlivened the controversy. The dispute hath been so often canvassed, that without these it would have been too dull and languid to meet with attention. I have therefore endeavoured to walk in your steps, and to be your humble imitator. Whether or not I have done it to your mind, and seasoned my *ragout* in such a manner as to please your palate, yourself alone must determine. It may be, after all the pains I have taken to divert you, that you will give me for a motto,—*little wit and no manners*. But, be this as it will, I shall still honour and esteem you as a brother *barlequin*. We have both of us mounted the stage, and done our utmost,—you to banter the *Doctor*, and I *you*: and, doubtless, the public is greatly beholden to us for the diversion we have given them. As to those demure and vinegar-faced christians who think it a crime to laugh out-right,—never
mind

viii D E D I C A T I O N.

mind them. For it would be hard indeed,—very hard,—if such a young, and such an ingenious performer as you are, should be debarred the privilege of displaying his wit to the world, and tasting the sweets of applause ;—and harder, much harder still, if a young *layman*, as I am, should be denied the liberty to be as merry as a *young divine*.

PHILALETHES again! &c.

IF any person should take offence (and it is possible that many of my readers may) at the renewal of a controversy which hath been thoroughly canvassed, and well nigh drained and exhausted long ago,—let him consider, in the first place, that we have not revived the dispute as *aggressors*, but only engaged in it as *defendants*. The honour of sounding the alarm, and beginning the contest afresh, belongs to *Candidus*. *Philaethes* hath only yielded to the summons, and accepted the challenge which hath been publicly given to any one who should have the hardiness to measure swords, and make a trial of his prowess. If indeed he had purposely attended on Mr. *Mayo* as a preacher, and carefully watched for an opportunity to attack a pastoral, and an occasional discourse as delivered from the pulpit;—if, moreover, to display his wit and his abilities to all the world, he had commenced the dispute in the public newspapers; then, it might have been truly said, that he hath not scrupled (as far in him lay) to sacrifice the peace and the good harmony of his fellow-christians to his own youthful ambition, and that he hath only sought to raise a name, and be adored as the fearless champion of a party. But, on the contrary, if such imputations may be justly fastened upon *Candidus*, where is the harm

of standing up to defend ourselves, or of endeavouring to repel argument by argument, and ridicule by ridicule?

Let the impartial reader consider, in the next place, that such a defence is not only very excusable, but highly proper. We know, indeed, that the argument hath already been discussed in every part of it, by much abler writers than *Philaethes*. But if we reflect, that Mr. *Mayo's* pamphlet may fall into the hands of many who are not provided with those writers; or, if they are, have neither leisure nor capacity to select the proper answers,—the following attempt, provided it is executed with judgment, will not be condemned as altogether needless and impertinent.

If it should be farther objected, that the debates and the animosities among christians are already so fierce, that there is occasion rather to *quench* the fire than to *feed* it;—I must answer, that *he* is the man who foment divisions, and acts the part of an incendiary,—*not* who ventures to stand forth and vindicate his principles, when they are openly and severely stigmatized,—but *he* who first begins the dispute,—he who wantonly applies the torch, and kindles the flames of contention. It is also worthy of remark, that when such a person hath taught those of his own party, who have little knowledge and great zeal, that their opponents have espoused sentiments which are scarcely capable of even a tolerable defence; the most probable and the most effectual means to get the better of their contempt, and abate their uncharitable confidence, is to let them see that we have abundantly more to urge in our own behalf than they have been made to believe. If christians would but take the trouble to read
both

both sides, and examine seriously what the opposite party in a dispute are able to say for themselves, they would be more moderate in their censures;—they would no longer despise their brethren as contending and wrangling for they know not what, and persisting in opinions which common reason would blush to vindicate, but learn for the future to place each other upon a more decent and a more respectable footing. Their over-heated zeal would grow cooler, their personal prejudices would insensibly die away, and they would soon begin to love and honour those as *fellow-christians*, whom before they could scarcely own as *fellow-men*. It is therefore evident that contentions are kindled and fomented, not by those who defend their sentiments when they are publicly ridiculed and pelted at, but by those who, unprovoked, disgrace the principles of their brethren, and set them up as a convenient mark for the scorn of every stupid zealot.

Whether Mr. *Mayo* hath acted this mean, this low, this ungenerous part, will best appear from his own account of the rise of the present controversy, in letter the first. He went, it seems, to the *dipping* of Mr. *Carmichael*.—Wherefore?—Verily, from an expectation of being most highly *entertained* and *profited**. But why so full of expectation? Truly, because a D. D. was to officiate.—Were his expectations then fully gratified? By no means. On the contrary, so great was his *disappointment*, his *surprize*, his *vexation*†, that he could not possibly put up with it; but, when the service was over, immediately determined to seek his revenge upon the doctor, for his loss of time, by giving him *a gentle admonition or two in the public*

lic papers *. This he accordingly did, and thus laid the foundation of a dispute, from whence he promised himself the most extensive and never-dying fame. What an admirable contrivance this ! And what a marvellous pretty excuse for reviving a contest of which the world is almost weary ! Because the doctor, forsooth, had played his part as a preacher like an errant blunderbuss, and defended his principles like a dunce,—*Ergo*, it was Mr. Mayo's duty to scud home to his study, commence author, and answer that in print which himself hath pronounced to have been scarcely worth his hearing. Yea, verily, *he was full of matter, and the spirit within him constrained him. His belly was as wine which hath no vent, and was ready to burst like new bottles.* Accordingly write he *would*, and write he *did*, that his soul within him might be refreshed. This, and this alone, produced the quarrel, such as it is, and gave rise to all that *snarling* and *popping*, of which our young adventurer hath so bitterly complained †.

But wherefore should he complain ? For knowing, as he tells us, the doctor's great fondness to appear in print, so that there is hardly an occasional sermon he preaches but what is published *at or by request* ‡, one would have thought that he might have had a little patience. If he had but waited till the Doctor's preachment had issued from the press, and been fairly published in black and white, he might then have taken the field with a better grace, and persuaded the world that he hath only acted upon the defensive. But this, alas, would never do ! It was possible the Doctor's sermon might *not* have been printed ; and, then, what had become of the merry sal-
lies

lies, the witty conceits, and the ingenious strictures which swelled the teeming fancy of *Candidus*? And what had become of the towering hopes, and lofty views, which filled his labouring breast? He therefore chose, like a sensible youth, to take time by the forelock, and seized the favourable moment to acquire a name, and start up a man of consequence, before it gave him the slip; for,

“ He who wills not when he may,

“ When he wills he shall have *nay*.”

Let our author, then, if he has been treated with greater severity than he can easily relish, ascribe it wholly to his own impatience. Let him be contented to pay the tax of his over-hasty eminence, and take the bitter with the sweet. If, indeed, he had condescended to have been more delicate, more ingenuous, and more equitable, in his manner of commencing and conducting the controversy, we also had been more respectful in our reply. If he had begun the attack, not upon a sermon as delivered from the pulpit, but on a legible and a printed discourse,—if, moreover he had combated the Doctor’s arguments without abusing his character, and ridiculed him as an author without reproaching him as a man,—if he had argued without calumny, and reasoned without invective, and been merry without ill-nature,—in short, if he had tempered the earnestness of an opponent with the decent gravity of a divine, and qualified his wit, as a writer, with the chearful innocence of a christian,—we might then have been more sparing of our censure, and handled him, not as a persecuting scribler, but as a fair and a respectable antagonist. Let the reader remember this, and I am persuaded that he will forgive

the freedom of our answer, and the mirthful language in which we have sometimes indulged ourselves. We have only replied to *Candidus* in his own way, and returned the arrows which were first discharged at the poor baptists from his own bow. This we think is the more excusable, as it can never prejudice the argument; for, in the opinion of wise men, whatsoever can endure the test of *reason*, will likewise stand the test of *ridicule*. Even those literary *connoisseurs*, those worthy *liēors* of criticism*, those wakeful centinels of scholastic fame, and trusty guardians of truth and reason, the *monthly reviewers*,—even *these*, I say, have frequently cooled the ambition, and sunk the credit of aspiring scribblers, by fousing them, not indeed in *the muddy mixtures of Fleet-ditch*, but in the pure *Castalian* streams. I hope, therefore, that what these wits of the age have indulged themselves in, as justifiable, will not be imputed to me as a heinous crime; though there may be as much difference between my wit and their's, as between a dirty horsepond, and the *limpid* waters of the river *Jordan*.

As to any other disputes which may be apprehended from the bold severities we have used, the reader may make himself easy. For be it known, that Mr. *Henry Mayo* hath wisely resolved

* A *liēor* among the ancient *Romans* was, in some respects, much the same as a *Jack Ketch* is among the *English*. N. B. This is only a *splash* by the bye: if people stand in the way, they must take what follows.

“ Thus many an honest man we’ve seen
 “ Intruding dirty trimmers ’tween,
 “ To pacify their noise and strife,
 “ Or making peace ’tween man and wife,
 “ Most sily with mud defil’d,
 “ And clothes on’s back uncivilly spoil’d.”

solved to treat my *Humble Attempt* with *silent contempt*; because this, he hath written, is the very treatment which it richly deserves in the opinion of some of the most eminent *Anti-pædobaptists*. *Philaletes*, therefore, may now chatter, and frown, and laugh with absolute impunity, and the reader peruse his scribble without pain. I shall accordingly proceed in my answer to the six letters, and leave the merits of it, as before, to be decided by the impartial public.

The first part of the dispute hath been discussed. We have enquired, in our former pamphlet, into the *mode* of baptism, and examined whether *sprinkling* or *immersion* is the most proper, and the most scriptural way of administering it. For as to the practice of the *Anti-pædobaptists* in *Holland**, this is nothing to the purpose; since we are not disputing whether they *do*, but whether they *ought* to sprinkle. Neither is the plea from the coldness of particular climates, nor from the different customs and dresses of particular people†, a whit more reasonable. For, in the first place, it is well known that immersion is the established practice of the *Russians*, who live in a climate abundantly colder than that of *England*:—And, in the next place, every plea for an alteration must be grounded on the very supposition we are labouring to prove,—namely, that the scriptural and the apostolic mode of baptism was *dipping*, or *plunging*. Besides, if the seeming, or even the real inconvenience of a religious and a divine institution, is a sufficient plea for altering the *mode* of it,—the *Israelites*, during their travels in the wilderness, might have circumcised either an ear or a finger, instead of *postponing* the ordi-

nance. But they wisely chose the latter step; because, in fact, to *change* an ordinance, is to *corrupt* and *destroy* it. The next thing, then, to be considered is, who are the proper and the scriptural *subjects* of baptism. This point shall be the enquiry of the following pages.

But, before we enter upon the controversy, it will be necessary to clear away the rubbish with which our author hath encumbered it. For, like a crafty champion, as he is, he hath laboured hard to prejudice the reader against his opponent as a very monster of cruelty;—because he is well apprized, that it is a general, though, doubtless, a mistaken practice, to form our sentiments of any doctrine or principle, not from the nature of the evidence, but from our opinion of the person who upholds it. Accordingly, in letter the fifth, he begins with assuring us, that the Doctor hath treated *all children*, without exception, as *unclean**, not suffering them to be admitted into the church of God; and not only so, but that he likewise looks upon the Pædobaptists in general as *unclean*, since he would not sit down with one of them at the Lord's table, nor admit him into his church as a member, were he *Moses, Elias, St. Paul, or an angel from heaven!*† He hath farther told us, in page the 41st, that the Doctor hath curtailed the spiritual promises and privileges which children enjoyed under the *Jewish* dispensation (all rigorous as it was) and cast them out of God's church, and treated them as *Scythians and Barbarians*. Lastly, (see page the 55th) the Doctor would willingly deprive infants of an ordinance which is frequently sanctified to the subject, and, if they die before years of discretion, rob their parents of the comfort, that
by

by baptism they had devoted them to God, and that he hath therefore taken them as his heirs to dwell with himself for ever, and to possess an incorruptible inheritance.

These charges, it must be owned, are as severe as they are invidious; and, if they were but fairly proved, would be sufficient to rouse the indignation of parents in general, and excite in the breast of every tender mother, and every affectionate father, an utter abhorrence of the man who would thus injure and abuse their infant-offspring. But let us not be rash in passing sentence, nor condemn till we have carefully, thoroughly, and impartially considered the *why* and the *wherefore*. Hard names, injurious reflections, and reproachful invectives, are the common resources of those who make it their business,—not to enquire after truth, but to promote the interests of a party. These are the scare-crows, the bug-bears, with which they terrify and drive the ignorant into what they would, but cannot reason them. But men of sense and understanding will never suffer themselves to be thus imposed upon, nor condescend to be tampered with like children. No, truly, if they are to believe an accusation, they will expect to be treated like rational judges, and require a stronger and a more satisfactory proof of what is alledged, than mere invective and dirty language. To such, therefore, would I now address myself,—persuaded, as I am, that they will think it but a reasonable precaution that we should clear ourselves from every imputation of religious cruelty, before we proceed to a farther vindication,—and persuaded, moreover, that throwing aside all prejudice and party-zeal, they will weigh my defence in the equitable scales of reason.

son, and pay a favourable regard to what I say, so far, and no farther than what I say, shall appear to be *right*.

In the first place, then, let us answer to the charge,—the invidious charge,—that Dr. Gill hath treated *all children as unclean without exception* *. Here we shall enquire upon what proofs our author hath grounded what he says. For, though he is far from being over-burthened with modesty, he neither hath, nor ever will be bold enough to tell the public, that the Doctor hath any where spoken of children as unclean in express words. If he was once to offer such a hint, we might instantly confound him. We might defy him, with all his wresting and torturing, to produce even a single passage, or a single expression, from the Doctor's writings to support his calumny. He hath, therefore, endeavoured to impose upon us another way. He hath laboured to prop up his charge by wrong inferences and false deductions, and very artfully insinuated what he could never have roundly asserted. The Doctor, forsooth, cannot in conscience administer baptism to infants;—*ergo*, he must look upon all of them as *unclean* without exception; that is, he must consider them as a far more polluted and despicable set of beings than adult persons. But how does *Candidus* know that the Doctor's reason for not baptizing children is because he looks upon them as *unclean*? Hath the Doctor himself ever told him so? On the contrary, the reasons he hath mentioned for his not approving and practising infant-baptism are, that there is neither precept nor example for it in the New Testament; and that infants have no visible capacity for the exercise of faith
and

and repentance which are particularly and expressly mentioned in the gospel as necessary qualifications for baptism. How, then, it may well be asked, hath our author cleared up his point? Why, the drift of what he urges is plainly this. "Baptism is an ordinance which admits the subject into the gospel-church; consequently, if the Doctor refuses to baptize children (as he undoubtedly does) he will not suffer them to be admitted into the church of God." The answer, however, is very easy. For nothing can be plainer than that the church, into which baptism admits the subject, is only the *visible* church. But who can be ignorant that the persons to be admitted into the *visible* church, should either *be*, or at least *appear* to be members of the *invisible* church? Otherwise, we might administer baptism to jews and infidels, and to wretches of the most unchristian character, both as to principle and practice. If Mr. *Mayo* should ask us, by way of reply, whether the Doctor will affirm that *no* infants are members of the *invisible* church? I answer, he will not. He is so far from it, that on the contrary, he hath openly declared that the everlasting salvation of those who may die in their infancy is a point which he hath never yet disputed. (See the Divine Right of Infant-Baptism examined and disproved, p. 70.) But, in return, let me ask Mr. *Mayo*, whether he believes that *all* infants are members of the invisible church? If they *are*, how happens it that so many of them, as they grow up into manhood, are continually degenerating into mere reprobates and apostates, not excepting *even the children of believers*? But if they are *not*, by what probable rule may we distinguish those who really *are* members, from those who

neither

neither *are*, nor ever *will* be so? Till such a rule can be discovered, we must beg leave to retain our principles, or, if Mr. *Mayo* will have it so, our uncharitableness, our obstinacy, our cruelty, and still refuse to admit infants as visible members of the church. In other words, we shall think it full time enough to admit a person into the *visible* church, when we can do it with a safe conscience, and find a *visible* reason to consider him as a member of the kingdom of heaven;—and all this we may do, without despising infants as *unclean*, or excluding them from the regions of bliss and eternal happiness.

But such a hearty friend as Mr. *Mayo* would appear to be to the cause of helpless infants, we might imagine that he respects them all as so many saints *incog.* or rather angels; and that he would sooner, much sooner, deprive a lawful heir of his estate, than exclude them from any of the privileges of the gospel-church. For if children have a right to one of its ordinances, wherefore not to another? If they have a right to baptism, wherefore not to the supper?—But here our author's charity will disappoint them. Baptized they *may* and *must* be, but nothing farther! He hath, however, very stiffly insisted upon it, that the Doctor must certainly look upon the *Pædobaptists* as *unclean*, because he will not receive them as fellow-communicants. Why, therefore, may we not return the compliment, and insist upon it, for the very same reason, that in Mr. *Mayo's* opinion all *infants* must be *unclean*. I do not say that he really harbours such an opinion, but only mean that it might be as plausibly imputed to himself as to the Doctor. For he would not fail to look upon it as a great folly, and great presumption, if

we

we should admit infants to the Lord's table. He talks, indeed, of receiving them into the church by baptism; but this, alas! is mere talk, and nothing better. For, notwithstanding their baptism, it is matter of fact that many hundreds (and indeed the greatest part of them) are never suffered to partake of the supper, and commence actual church-members; I will not say in their infancy, but even afterwards, when they are grown to years of full maturity. No, truly, this is a privilege which is only reserved for a few here and there;—and even these must plead a better right than that of baptism, or the covenant of God with their parents. They must give a particular and a critical account of their past experiences, and make a confession of their faith.—Otherwise they will never be duly and truly received into a church, into which they have been *as if*, or *as it were* received, a number of years ago. Let me appeal to Mr. Mayo, if he hath not many instances of this sort in his *own* congregation,—many persons, who, as he says, have been received into his church by baptism, in their very infancy, when after all they neither *are*, and perhaps *never will* be acknowledged as real members. Verily, good reader, this is downright trifling, and dealing with children like mere innocents as they are. We are told, indeed, that they are received into the visible church in real earnest; which, to be sure, hath a very enchanting sound with it. But the misfortune is, when all comes to all, that this boasted *visible* church is, in truth, a sort of *visible invisible*, or invisible visible, which you please; for not one in a hundred,
 who

who have been received into it in their childhood, can ever afterwards find the way to it; and those who can, have met with full as much difficulty to be *re-admitted*, as if they were mere strangers, and had never belonged to it. So that, in short, notwithstanding the noise and the clamour about their covenant-right, and their covenant-interest, they are in full as bad a case as an unfortunate heir without an estate, or a lord without a title.

Let us now proceed to the next charge,—which is, that the Doctor not only looks upon infants, but on *Pædobaptists in general as unclean*; because, truly, he would not sit down with one of them at the Lord's table, nor admit him into his church as a member, *were he Moses, Elias, St. Paul, or an angel from heaven!**—But, O thou, the fair picture of benevolence, the bright emblem of moderation, and the perfect model of christian charity,—how dost thou know that the Doctor looks upon all, who differ from him, as unclean? Hath he ever told thee so? So far from it, that you yourself have honestly informed us that he hath *insinuated*,—that is, that he hath publicly declared,—that he hath no such opinion of the Pædobaptists, or that he doth not look upon them as *unclean*! Verily, good reader, we must live in cruel times when we cannot venture to take the word of a sober man for what is, or what is not, his own opinion. It is to be hoped, however, all-severe as the world is grown, that Mr. Mayo must fairly prove what he has thus *charitably* insinuated, before the public will condescend to believe him. But how will he prove it. Hath not he already told us that persons are admitted, or initiated into the church by baptism?

tism? And does he not believe that baptism is the only ordinance for that purpose? If so,—all he says amounts to this,—that the Doctor is such a narrow-spirited bigot, that he will by no means admit those into his church who are not willing to be admitted,—or that he will not admit them upon any account before he does admit them. If, indeed, he had told us that the Doctor would refuse to *baptize* a Pædobaptist, he would have said something. But, at present, what he hath said amounts to nothing. For the Doctor's reason for not admitting Pædobaptists to the Lord's table,—is, not because he looks upon them as *unclean*, or despises all of them as mere reprobates and infidels, but only because he considers them as never *truly baptized*;—an objection which would be thought sufficient to exclude from the supper by any other party*. Mr. Mayo, I suppose would himself behave as rigidly in a similar case. Let us only imagine, for instance, that a well-meaning, but whimsical person, should make him a visit, and request the favour to be received into his church,—telling him withal that he must crave the indulgence to be excused from eating of the sacramental bread, and drinking the wine. “I am willing, says the man, to sit down with you as a fellow-communicant, and commence a
“ member

* *Query.* Should a Pagan or a Turk be called by divine grace to embrace the truth, would Mr. Mayo receive either of them as a fellow-communicant before baptism? If not, he would observe the very self-same conduct towards these, which he blames in the Doctor towards *sprinkled christians*: for he well knows that the Doctor considers even *believing* Pædobaptists, not indeed as *unbaptized heathens*, (see p. 2.) but, however, as *unbaptized christians*;—otherwise he must look upon *sprinkling* as valid baptism, and both approve and disapprove of it at the same time.

“ member of the christian brotherhood ; but as
 “ the bread and the wine are mere emblems, I
 “ think it sufficient to behold the one as broken,
 “ and the other as poured forth.”—What reply
 would Mr. *Mayo* return him ? Would he admit
 him as a member,—or would he not ? I believe,
 in this case, I may venture to answer in the *neg-*
ative. Give me leave, then, to propose the ques-
 tion, whether baptism is not as much an ordi-
 nance of the gospel-church as the Lord’s supper ?
 And, if it is so, whether it will not follow that
 every member should have just notions of the
 one as well as of the other ? Either *both* of them
 should be properly understood, and properly
 administered ; or, on the other hand, they must
both be immaterial, and *both* of little conse-
 quence ;—and thus to prevent trouble, and
 open a door as wide as possible, we may set up a
 church without any ordinance at all.

But what does it signify, to argue with those
 who are resolved to carry their point at all adven-
 tures ; For the bottom of the story is this ;—it
 would be a considerable support to our author’s
 ill-founded cause, that the Doctor should be
 deemed a stubborn and an incorrigible bigot,
 and for this reason, and no other, a stubborn
 and an incorrigible bigot he must be. One
 would think, however, that those men who are
 so fond of preaching up charity and moderation,
 upon every trifling dispute, should condescend to
 lead the way, and shew that they *themselves* are
 as meek and gentle as they would persuade *other*
people to be. But is this the case with *Candidus* ?
 Yes, truly, poor harmless man ! if we are dis-
 posed to take his word for it, his whole *desire*
and resolution is to live and go on unto perfection
in

in that divine grace charity *, and to receive and love his christian brethren, as *Christ hath received and loved him*. Accordingly, his angry snarls and warm invectives, are nothing more than *gentle touches* †;—his numerous and very illiberal misrepresentations of the Doctor's sermon are *candid strictures* ‡;—his unchristian insults on the Doctor's character are only *brotherly rebukes*, and evident marks of his *kind intentions* §;—and his rude attacks and scurrilous witticisms, of which the public papers themselves were soon weary, were but *gentle admonitions* ||. It is to be hoped, however, that christians will *think* as well as *read*, and that our author must qualify his wit a little better, and condescend to address the baptists in softer and more obliging terms than he hath yet done, before he will be deemed the mighty charitable man he would fain pass for! The Doctor and his followers, it should seem, are mere bigots, and employ all the *cunning craftiness* they are masters of to stagger wavering Pædobaptists **,—yea, “ *they would compass sea and land to make one proselyte to dipping, and glory more in him than in ninety and nine proselytes to righteousness and holiness.*” But, on the other hand, the benevolent letters of *Candidus* are wholly calculated “ *to promote charity, and love, and mutual forbearance among those who differ in an external rite* †.” Alas! what a wide, wide difference! But if a man's own writings, which he hath digested and revised, and put together himself, and published as his own, may determine any thing as to his temper, the

C witty

* Page 72. † P. 3, l. 23. ‡ P. 4. l. 4. § P. 3, l. 63, and p. 72. || P. 3, l. 11, 12. ** P. Vide preface to the letters. †† Vide preface.

witty *Candidus* is not such a prodigy of christian love and moderation, as he has modestly pretended to be! He is far, very far from it! As fair proofs of what I say, I might appeal to the many scornful and contemptuous speeches with which he hath pelted us, as if all of us were mere ideots and ignoramuses;—I might appeal to the many reproachful invectives with which he hath belaboured us, as if we were indeed the constant troublers of *Israel*;—I might appeal to the many personal, and the very invidious reflections, with which he hath bespattered the Doctor's character;—I might appeal, in the last place, to every ranting, noisy, tippling-house, and every drunken tap-room, for *these* also have been filled with the controversy of baptism, and giggled, I trow, full merrily at our author's sharp-pointed satire;—Yes, I might appeal to them all, and call them all to witness, that even Mr. *Mayo* can give the reins to his impatient zeal, and charge his antagonist with as much fury and resolution, as any *warry bigot*, or *christian Pharisee* whatever! “ If protestants, therefore, can thus treat their brethren, and give way to *malice*, and *envies*, and *evil-speakings*, no wonder if the infallible church of Rome to fiery words adds stakes, to convince us theirs is the right way, and the true church, and compel us to come in*.” I might add, that small would be the wonder (provided they should ever have the power to do it) to behold some persons displaying their charity towards the bigotted Baptists, by something harder than hard words. For the times have been (God grant they may never return) when *Anabaptism* hath bitterly groaned under the oppressive cruelty of its

its enemies. If the reader is desirous to peruse any instances of this nature, let him consult Mr. *David Rees**, who will furnish him with enough to make him abhor, and for ever curie the intemperate zeal which hath carried the disputes between fellow-men and fellow christians, not only to rough names and angry speeches, but to imprisonment,—blood,—and slaughter! Yes, there still are, and always have been, too many bigots, too many forward and unthinking bigots, in all parties. Heaven forbid that any of them, in any party, should ever have it in their power to shew us how gentle, and how charitable they really are!

But to say no more about bigotry, which we may certainly object against Mr. *Mayo*, with as good a grace as he can charge it upon the Baptists,—let us proceed in our proposed defence.—The Doctor, then, it seems, is farther culpable, for depriving infants of an ordinance (that is *baptism*) which is frequently *sanctified to the subject*, and, consequently, if they leave the world before years of discretion, robbing their parents of the comfort, that by baptism they had devoted them to God, and that he hath therefore taken them as his heirs, to possess an eternal and an incorruptible inheritance, see page the 55th.—But let us enquire, in the first place, wherefore we should look upon infant-baptism as an ordinance which is frequently *sanctified to the subject*? The reason Mr. *Mayo* hath offered is, because prayer and thanksgiving will not only sanctify *other divine institutions*, but even the common bounties of Providence. Now it is easy to answer, that, as to the common bounties of Providence,

C 2

dence,

* *Vide*, His infant-baptism no institution of Christ, p. 207—220.

dence, these may be *lawfully* and very innocently enjoyed; and so far as they are so, we may reasonably pray for, and expect a blessing to attend them. In the same manner, if infant-baptism may be *lawfully* practised,—*that* also may be frequently sanctified to the subject. But *can* it be lawfully practised? Let this be proved, and we shall readily submit to the inference. We are all sensible, that in cases of abuse, we cannot hope for a blessing, even upon the common and the most ordinary enjoyments of life. Wherefore, then, should we hope for a blessing upon a sacred ordinance, when that ordinance is misapplied and perverted?—When it is administered to those who were never declared as proper subjects of it by the institutor? Or why should we compare infant-baptism with other sacred and divine institutions, when, in fact, itself is only a *human* institution? Perhaps, then our Author would refer us to *experience*. In this case his argument will be, that many baptized infants, when grown to manhood, have proved to be godly and very worthy christians;—*ergo*, baptism to *them* was a *sanctified* ordinance. But is this the case with *all* baptized infants? I wish I could believe, in the judgment of charity, that it were the case with one half, or even with a quarter of them:—I could wish it for the sake of the persons so baptized, and I could wish it for the sake of their pious and worthy parents, who, it is to be feared, have many of them had the most melancholly, and the most afflicting proofs, that baptized infants may become very indifferent christians, and very unfit for church-communion. What shall we say, then? Shall we attribute the faith and the christian piety of a few, to the virtue of their baptism, as sanctified

fied by the prayers of their parents? If so, why should not all, who receive baptism under the same advantages, receive the ordinance with equal benefit? Verily, *it is neither of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God who sheweth mercy*,—who sheweth mercy not in consequence of a man's baptism in his infancy, but of the covenant with the glorious head and representative of the invisible church.

As to the comfort which infant-baptism may administer to parents under the loss of their children, they are highly welcome to enjoy it. I am not desirous to aggravate their sorrows, and deprive them of the only consolation which religious prejudice hath left them. No; let them rather sooth their inward grief, and allay the throbbing anguish of their minds, as well as they are able.—But when sorrow gives way to reflection, and the tempest of disappointed fondness begins to abate;—when the dawn of thought succeeds the night of affliction, and reason, like the rising sun, hath dispell'd the gloom of distress,—then forgive me if I venture to expostulate. Forgive me if I ask the question,—Wherefore the friends and the advocates of infant-baptism should have more favourable hopes of their once-beloved, but now departed offspring than their Baptist brethren? Will baptism save the children of the one? Or will the want of it destroy the children of the others?—No, truly; but those who have baptized their children, have *devoted them to God*. What! have they prayed for them? Have they recommended them to the divine favour, with all the earnestness which parental fondness can inspire? So have *we*. God forbid we should do otherwise!—"Aye, but
 " christian baptism gives *admission* into the chris-
 C 3 " tian

“ tian church. It is the seal of the covenant,
 “ and the seal of all spiritual and and eternal
 “ blessings.” But was it designed to admit *in-*
fants into the church? Into a religious society
 which they cannot join with in one single act of
 worship? Or is it matter of fact, that it seals to
 the subjects the blessings of grace and salvation?
 Experience, alas, has testified to the contrary,
 in a hundred and a hundred thousand instances!
 Nor is baptism ever mentioned as the *seal* of the
 covenant,—of any covenant whatsoever. Let
 parents then build their hopes and their comfort,
 not upon a ceremony of human invention, (such
 as infant-baptism) but upon the goodness of Al-
 mighty God,—*that* God who extends his care to
 the very beasts of the forest, and regards the
 happiness of every contemptible sparrow, and of
 a still more despicable insect; how much ra-
 ther, then, will he bless the offspring, the dy-
 ing, harmless offspring of those who fear him,—
 those who have called upon his name, and em-
 braced the faith of his well-beloved and his only
 begotten son! For my part, be it far, very far
 from me, to condemn the infants even of the
 vilest of men. Let me leave them to the great
 Father of mercies, who can, and often *does*, dis-
 play his goodness upon their *adult* posterity (how
 much more, then, upon their *departing* helpless
 babes?) though he justly withholds it from the
 wicked and unbelieving parents. Wherefore,
 then, should faithful christians distrust his mer-
 cy, and fly for comfort to a practice which he
 hath never instituted? Let us rather trust him
 in his own way,—and recommend our children
 to his fatherly pity and compassion, not by me-
 thods which he hath no where required, but by
 those

those fervent and importunate prayers which are seldom known to pass unnoticed and unrewarded!

Having thus endeavoured to remove the prejudices which have been raised against the opposers of infant-baptism, and proved that we neither look upon children as *unclean*, nor despise our Pædobaptist brethren as unbaptized *heathens*, nor deprive parents of any reasonable ground of comfort under the loss of their offspring,—let us now proceed to the controversy.

We are to enquire, then, who are the *proper and the scriptural subjects* of christian baptism.—These are defined by the Doctor to be “*repenting sinners, believers in Christ, disciples of Christ, and receivers of the spirit of God;*”—a definition which seems, in our author’s opinion, to be very impertinent, very unfair, and very erroneous. He thinks it impertinent, because no man can have the spirit of God and of Christ, and not be all the rest*,—that is repenting sinners, believers in Christ, and disciples of Christ. It will therefore follow, that the last, or, if he pleases, the two last expressions, are *synonymous* to, and include the two former. I dare say, that in this the Doctor will readily agree with him. Where, then, is the candor, or the good sense, in representing those to be intended as *distinct* ideas, which, in fact, were only meant as *similar* ones? at this rate, we might turn the best and the ablest writers we have into mere triflers, and disgrace them with distinctions which they never intended or thought of.—But what is the inference from the fourfold distinction which our author hath fathered upon the Doctor? That his drift was to receive *all the professing world* into the church *except* (he cer-

C 4

tainly

tainly means, *and exclude*) *harmless infants**; for though the latter *may be receivers of the spirit of God*, they can never *profess* repentance or faith in Christ. Now one might imagine, from hence, that Mr. Mayo had unwarily forgotten himself;—for if, as he says, (and as *we* say too) there is no difference between receiving the spirit of God, and receiving faith and repentance, it must certainly follow, that it is as possible to profess the one as the other: because, in fact, the profession will be the same in both cases. So that infants will be as much excluded by one expression as by the other; for if professing to have received the spirit, or professing faith and repentance are required in baptism, (which is manifestly the Doctor's meaning) none should be baptized but those who can make such a profession, and consequently not infants.

Thus, then, it appears that the Doctor's definition is neither impertinent nor unfair. Let us next enquire into the truth of it. Go, then, says Mr. Mayo, and tell your champion, that he hath a scripture precedent for baptizing *an adult person an unbeliever*†. He means *Simon Magus*. Nay, says he, if the Doctor was never to baptize any person till it was clear and evident that he hath received the grace of God, was he to live to *Methuselah's* years he would never baptize another. But let us have a little patience, and fairly understand each other's meaning, before we proceed to draw conclusions.

What

* Page 38. *Query*, Is it good sense to speak of infants as *excepted* out of the professing world? If not, the witty *Candidus* hath but small occasion to triumph over the poor lay-preachers for their breach of grammar,—a crime which is far more excusable than absolute nonsense.

† Page 38.

What the Doctor hath maintained is,—not that every man who is baptized is *really* a repenting sinner, and a believer in Christ, but only that he *ought* to be so;—and, consequently, that we *ought* to baptize none whom we cannot receive as such in the judgment of christian charity. It will therefore be easy to account for the baptism of *Simon Magus*, and to vindicate the practice on such modern professors as may afterwards have been found to resemble him in his vile hypocrisy. Both the one and the others were baptized on their verbal *profession*:—why? Because their profession was then supposed to be *sincere*. For neither *Philip*, nor *Dr. Gill*, had such a spirit of discernment as to be able to judge of the *sincerity* of a man's profession, any otherwise than by rational appearances, which, it is to be hoped, though they sometimes *may*, and often *have* deceived us, will not be found to have done so in all cases. Our author, indeed, hath insinuated, that a desire to be overwhelmed in water is *the clearest proof in the world, with some, of a person's meetness for the church and table of Christ* *. When abusive raillery shall pass for argument, this reflection may claim a serious answer; but till then we shall leave the *candid Mr. Mayo* to enjoy the credit of it. As to what he hath farther urged,—that ministers have a greater encouragement, and stronger foundation, to baptize the infants of believing parents, than to baptize any on their own bare profession, who may deceive and impose upon them †,—it is sufficient to ask him, whether the parents themselves are not considered as believers, on their own bare profession, as much as the adult baptized, and may not therefore deceive and

and impose upon us with equal ease? If they may, his observation is nothing to the purpose; because the encouragement or foundation he speaks of, will be as weak and uncertain, and indeed much more so, than what we have for *adult* baptism; since it is far more rational to baptize a person into the faith which *himself* professes, than 'upon the verbal faith of *another man*.

Our author's next resource is to the covenant made with *Abraham**. He hath, indeed, most severely rebuked the Doctor for censuring his opponents, as if they were weak enough to fetch a proof of the baptism of infants from the 17th of *Genesis*. This, he hath told us, is a *wilful misrepresentation*. He ought, however, as an *academic* and a *master of arts*, to have recollected that there are *two* kinds of proof, *direct* and *indirect*;—and that the latter may as properly be called a proof as the former; because, in fact, it is always intended as such by those who employ it. If, therefore, the covenant with *Abraham* is constantly and warmly urged by all the advocates of infant-baptism, it must certainly be considered as a proof either *direct* or *indirect*, or otherwise be wholly foreign to the purpose. In other words,—if Mr. *Mayo* is ashamed to *call* it a proof, why hath he mentioned it?—And if he is not, wherefore hath he censured the Doctor for representing it to be commonly urged as such? But, leaving our author to explain himself as well as he can, let us proceed to the argument.

The proper questions, then, which will arise from the covenant with *Abraham*, as it relates to the controversy, are such as these; *viz.*

“Doth

“ Doth it afford a proof that all the children
 “ of believers have an interest in the covenant
 “ of grace ?”

“ Was circumcision, as a token of the cove-
 “ nant, administered to distinguish those who
 “ were interested in it from those who were not,
 “ or was it instituted for some other purpose ?”

“ Is the relation of infants to the visible
 “ church under the *law*, a sufficient proof that
 “ they should also be admitted into the visible
 “ church under the gospel ?”

As to the first of these questions, one would imagine that an answer to it would be needless. For if the covenant of grace is a sure and an everlasting covenant, and *all* the children of believers are included in it, it will certainly follow, that they must *all* be eventually saved,—a notion which the most charitable man alive will never indulge ; because many hundreds of them, when grown to years of discretion, have, by their conduct, given us very sufficient reason to fear the contrary. But let us hear Mr. *Mayo*. His argument, then, amounts to this,—The covenant with *Abraham* was in part, if not chiefly, the same as the covenant of grace ; if, therefore, it was made with his seed as well as with himself, it will follow, that the covenant of grace includes the children as well as the parent.—That the covenant with *Abraham* was in part the covenant of grace, and that the blessings it pronounced were spiritual and eternal, our author hath inferred from what St. *Paul* hath said of it in *Rom.* 4th. and *Gal.* 3d. But let us reason without prejudice. If we are to take the apostle’s word for the *nature* of the covenant, should we not also take his word for the *persons concerned in it*.
 “ *Abraham*, says he, *was the father of all them*
 “ *that*

“ *that believe, though they be not circumcised,*
 “ *and the father of circumcision, to them who are*
 “ *not of the circumcision only, but who walk in*
 “ *the steps of that faith which he had being yet*
 “ *uncircumcised.*” See Rom. iv, 11, 12. Again,
 “ *If we be Christ’s, (that is, if by our faith we*
 “ *appear to be united to him as our spiritual head)*
 “ *then are we Abraham’s seed, and his heirs ac-*
 “ *cording to the promise.*” See Gal. iii, 29*.

Other passages might have been quoted to the same purpose: but it is as plain from hence as the plainest words can make it, that the *seed* who were interested in the covenant as a spiritual covenant were not the *natural* seed of Abraham, merely as such, but only his *spiritual* seed;—that is, only those who imitated his faith. But if not his *natural* seed, wherefore the natural seed of any *other* believer? Are the children of professing christians a whit more holy than the offspring of this illustrious father of the faithful? Or was the covenant made not only with the *spiritual seed themselves*, but with their very *children* also? If not, it will certainly follow, that the infants of believers, merely as such, have no greater right to the blessings of the covenant than other infants: because the right is not of nature, or derived from natural birth, but merely of grace.—But what! the reader, perhaps, will ask me, had Abraham’s *natural seed* no concern in the covenant? If they had not, for what reason were they *all* to be circumcised? This leads me to the second question; namely,

“ Whether

* Let the reader turn back to the 27th verse, and then determine whether the *spiritual seed* are not the only proper and scriptural subjects of baptism. “ As many of you as
 “ have been *baptized* into Christ, have *put on Christ.*”
 Query, is this applicable to infants?

“ Whether circumcision, as the token of the
 “ covenant, was only administered to distinguish
 “ those who were interested in it from those who
 “ were not, or whether it was instituted for
 “ some other purpose ?”

Now the answer to this will depend upon the light in which the covenant itself is considered. For if the covenant was a *temporal* covenant, and promised the possession of the land of *Canaan* in a literal sense, thus far it was most certainly fulfilled to the *natural* seed; and accordingly their interest in the promise, and their *public* relation to the Almighty as the God of *Israel*, or as the immediate governor and protector of the *Hebrew* people, was the foundation of their circumcision. But here of what concern is either the covenant, or its token, to professing christians? Unless, indeed, we may argue from a *temporal* covenant to a *spiritual* one,—and say, that if Abraham’s *natural* posterity were entitled to *temporal* blessings, it will follow, that the children of christians must have a right to *saving and eternal* blessings. This, however, will not be admitted as fair reasoning.—But, on the other hand, if the covenant was originally a *spiritual* one, and only an exhibition or transcript of the covenant of grace,—or, at least, so far as it was so, the case will be altered. For if it is allowed (and it certainly must be allowed) that many hundreds and many thousands, and, it may be, the greatest number of those who were circumcised, had no interest in *eternal* blessings,—if, moreover, many of Abraham’s believing contemporaries (such as *Lot*, *Melchisedec*, &c.) though doubtless in the covenant of grace, were never circumcised,—it will follow, either that the ordinance was misapplied, or that it was never intended

tended to specify the distinction we are speaking of. The token, therefore, in this light, must have been instituted for some other purpose,—*viz.* to distinguish those who were to be the subjects of a mere external or ceremonial dispensation, by which the blessings of the covenant were to be constantly typified and figured out till the coming of the Messiah. Accordingly, circumcision was administered to *infants*;—and administered to infants to confirm them as *visible members of the visible church of God*.—But if infants were members of the *visible* church under the *Jewish* dispensation, and, as such, had the visible sign or token of the covenant, wherefore should they be debarred from a similar privilege under the *christian* dispensation? In answer to this, let us enquire, as was proposed, in the third and last place,

“ Whether the relation of infants to the visible
 “ church under the *law*, is a proof that they
 “ should also be admitted into the visible church
 “ under the *gospel*?”

Here I must answer in the negative. I know, indeed, that the popular opinion is against me. But as the voice of the multitude is not in all cases on the side of truth, let us examine whether this *popular opinion* is not, in fact, a *popular mistake*. Give me leave, then, to propose the question,—Was the Jewish church on the same footing with the Christian church? The reader will doubtless answer, that the same God was worshipped in both, and that religious truth was the same in one as the other, though in the latter it was revealed to much greater advantage. But the question will still recur, is the Christian church a *national* church? Now, when I speak of a *national* church, it is evident, in the case before us, that

I must mean a church which is confined, as that of the Jews was, to one particular nation; and so modelled and constituted, that all the members of the *nation* should also be members of the *church*;—that is, *children* with their *parents*, *servants* with their *masters*, and *unbelievers* as well as *believers*. That this was the plan of the *jewish church* is notorious: for all, without exception, who belonged to the nation, whether as proper natives, or as naturalized foreigners, were considered as members of the *church*, that is of the *visible church*. But is this the case with the *christian church*? If it is, to what happy nation hath the Almighty confined the seat of it? And if it is not, what will become of the church-membership of infants? Should it be said that the faith of their parents is a sufficient plea for them,—that plea must be grounded, either on some express authority from the New Testament, or on their covenant-interest. But their covenant-interest hath been already disproved, and as for express authorities, I know of none.—Besides, the faith of the parent was not the circumstance which entitled even the *jewish* children to be received as members of the church; for they were always considered as such, whether their parents were believers or not;—otherwise, the greatest part of them would never have been circumcised at all. It is therefore evident, that the grounds of their relation to the church, were the mere circumstances of their birth, or their being *born* into the *jewish nation*. But if infants were members of the church under the *law*, only because that church was a *national* one, and *national by divine appointment*,—this is no proof that they should be admitted into *another church* which is *not national*. For, in the former case, such

such admittance was a mere privilege of birth ; but, in the latter, it must depend solely upon the character of the persons to be admitted. To make the case, if possible, still plainer, let us suppose an *adult person*, and not an infant, to be a candidate for christian baptism. To ascertain his right to it, he will tell us, perhaps, that he was born of believing parents. But shall we enquire no farther ? we should doubtless ask him, whether he himself could profess his faith in Christ, as his parents had done before him ? If he could not, we should reject him as an improper person to be baptized. On the other hand, let us suppose a Jew, who had never been circumcised. Should he propose himself to Jews for that purpose, he would probably be required to prove his right to it. How would he do this ? Why, perhaps he would produce witnesses that he was born a Jew, both by father and mother : and if his witness was valid, the enquiry could proceed no farther. He is a genuine son of *Israel*, and a descendant of *Abraham*, and, therefore, whether a saint or a sinner, he would be circumcised without delay. From this comparison it must appear, as plain as it well can be, that the ground of jewish church-membership was very different from that of admission into the church of Christ,—and, consequently, that the right of infants to the former, can be no proof of their right to the latter. The right in one case was purely *civil*, and in the other it must be purely *spiritual*.

If any thing farther remains to be noticed upon this head, it is the very artful and the very popular suggestion, that by opposing the church-membership of young children,—of mere infants,—we have made the privileges of the gospel to
be

be less than those under the law*. For under the law they were always considered as members. But, in the first place, gentle reader, had not the *jewish* infants a right to eat of the *passover*? And is it not pretended, to make up the pair, that this was succeeded by the sacrament of the Lord's supper? Wherefore, then, are not christian infants admitted to the *table*? Verily, here is *one* privilege gone; and a very considerable privilege it is!—Again, was church-membership confined to the infants of *believing, pious, and religious* Jews? If it was not, wherefore should it be confined to the infants of believing and religious christians? Here, then, is *another* privilege gone. *Moses*, therefore, was not so rigid as Mr. *Mayo* is;—or, at least, not so rigid as Mr. *Mayo* pretends to be in his *writings*.—But, to come to the point, how have we lessened the privileges of the law, by debarring infants from the *visible* church of Christ? Did circumcision save the *jewish* infants? Or will baptism save any *christian* infant? If not, what inhumanity are we guilty of, that we should be reproached as treating children like mere *Scythians* and *Barbarians*?† We all know that under the law no uncircumcised Jew would be suffered to join in religious worship, nor to enjoy the benefit of public ordinances. But is this the case with *unbaptized infants*? On the contrary, they are at full liberty to attend the ministry of the word as soon as they are capable, and to join in worship both public and private, and reap the benefit of a much clearer, and a far more perfect revelation than ever the Jews had. So that, in fact, they are possessed of much greater advantages, even without bap-

D

tism,

tism, than circumcision conferred on the *Israelites*. But is this a *diminution*, or is it not rather a manifest *increase* of privilege? Aye, says prejudice, but the jewish infants were *members of a church*. True, they were so;—but of what church? Why, merely of a *national* church;—a church which hath been long abolished and superseded by a far more glorious church; but at the same time by a church which is *not national*, and therefore cannot, in the nature of the thing, be supposed to admit of the membership of infants. Again,—the *jewish* infants when circumcised were confirmed as *real* members of the church, and continued so ever afterwards; which is far, very far from being the case with baptized infants in the *christian* church. So that, in effect, here is a *third* privilege gone! But, as we have already observed, the children of the Jews were only members of a national church,—a church which was encumbered with many severe and troublesome ceremonies, and with many rigorous though necessary institutions. Accordingly, the apostle hath considered circumcision as a yoke, an intolerable yoke, and esteems it a privilege that the gospel hath removed it. Wherefore then should we be desirous to return again to the former yoke of bondage?—Or to borrow a sacred and a christian ordinance from a troublesome rite, which, with the whole dispensation it was intended to support, hath been totally and for ever abolished? Tell it not in *Gath*, publish it not to the Jews, lest the circumcised should triumph, and be more abundantly hardened in their prejudices against the gospel of Christ, as indebted to a severe, a painful, and a very burdensome

denfome ceremony of the law for one of its moft folemn institutions !*

But this reminds me of another argument alledged againft us,—an argument which lies snug in a little note at the bottom of the page, like a watchful enemy in ambufcade. Mr. *Mayo*, truly, hath infinuated that the believing Jews, in Acts xxi, 20, 21, muft have thought their children to have been entitled to enter with them into the church of God, and that they were proper fubjects of it, *elſe* they would not have difputed about their *circumciſion*. But in this he hath made more haſte than good ſpeed, and, like an errant *Marplot*, helped us to an argument which might otherwiſe have eſcaped our notice. For, in the name of common reaſon, wherefore ſhould theſe tender and affectionate parents have been ſo mighty ſolicitous to ſecure to their children the *initiating* ordinance of circumciſion, if baptiſm came in the room of it; or if it had been the practice of the apoſtles to *initiate* children into the church by any *other* ordinance? Would not *one* ordinance have been ſufficient? Or would they have their children initiated twice over? Yes, truly, they were determined to make ſure work of it, and to have their children admitted into the church, both according to the *new* way and the *old* way, leſt haply the former ſhould prove ineffectual. What careful parents were theſe! Verily, friend *Mayo*, if thou art not an Antipædobaptiſt *incog.* yet give me leave to ſay, that you could never have choſen and ap-

D 2

plied

- * “ Thus did the ſons of Abraham paſs,
- “ Under the bloody ſeal of grace;
- “ The young diſciples bore the yoke,
- “ Till Chriſt the painful bondage broke.”

Watts, book ii, hymn 127.

plied a better argument, not to support, but to undermine and overthrow the cause for which you have so manfully contended !

But to proceed, our author hath farther informed us, that every covenant God made with men included children ; such as the covenant made with *Adam*, that with *Noah*, that with *Abraham*, that with *Moses* and the *Israelites*, that with the tribe of *Levi*, &c.—As to the covenant with *Adam*, “ it is most evident that it included his children, and that they were interested in it ; else how came sickness and death on his offspring, even upon them who sin not actually as he had done ? Rom. v, 12, “ 14.”—How, indeed ! But what is the inference of the apostle ? Hath he concluded that *all* the children of *all* believers are in the covenant of grace ? No such thing. He hath only inferred that as the guilt of *Adam* was entailed upon all his posterity, so the righteousness of Christ may be imputed to all who believe. Besides, Mr. *Mayo*’s argument will prove too much. For if it is allowed, as I suppose it will, that *Adam* was himself a believer, it will follow, according to this way of reasoning, that all his *children* were in the covenant of grace, and *their children* after them ; and so on, from generation to generation, till at last we shall include the whole world !—As to the covenant with *Noah*, this was not of *spiritual* but only of *temporal* concern, as is sufficiently evident from the places referred to ; for the covenant was made, not only with *Noah* and his *seed after him*, but *with every living creature that was with him, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth*. See Gen. ix, 10. It is likewise plain, as we have

have already proved, that the covenant with *Abraham*, so far as his *natural* posterity were engaged in it, was purely *civil*; and, consequently, the covenant with the Israelites was the same. But as to the covenant with the tribe of *Levi*, I must frankly acknowledge, that I am at a loss where to find it; for in Numb. iii, the chapter quoted by Mr. *Mayo*, there is no mention of a covenant. On the contrary, what is there recorded is not a covenant, but only an appointment or command. It is true, indeed, that in temporal and national concerns, *children were ever esteemed in their minority as one with their parents**; but that the case is the same in *spiritual* things, is a point which still remains to be proved.—Mr. *Mayo*, however, hath assured us, that children were members, real members of God's visible church, not only for *near two*, but for *above four thousand* years before Christ; that is, from the very beginning. But as we are not obliged to take his word,—his *bare word* for it, we shall beg leave to think otherwise: for at present he hath favoured us with nothing but *mere assertions*!

But it is time to hasten to the next article †.
 “ The Doctor then, it seems, hath said that it
 “ is an absurdity of absurdities, to affirm that
 “ baptism comes in the room of circumcision,
 “ since baptism was in force and use *long before*
 “ circumcision was abolished; circumcision was
 “ not abolished till the death of Christ, but bap-
 “ tism was administered *many years before*, to
 “ multitudes, by *John*, and by the order of
 “ Christ, and by his apostles. Now where is
 “ the good sense, (proceeds the Doctor) of
 “ saying one thing succeeds the other, when

D 3

“ the

“ the one said to succeed, was in use and force
 “ *long before* the other ceased ? ”——Now, verily, gentle reader, whether our D. D. had his diploma for his skill in *chronology*, I shall not pretend to determine ;—but that our M. A. had *his diploma* for his skill in *logic* is beyond dispute, and, in good troth, a most *excellent logician* he is ! Witness his answer to what the Doctor hath said as above. For he hath proved, to a demonstration, that *five years* are not *five hundred*, and that there is a considerable difference between a *few years* and *many years* ! What an amazing stretch of reason !—But, with the leave of this truly wonderful genius, this *Aristarchus* of the age, this theological *nonesuch* ; if John baptized only *five years*, or even but a *single year* before the death of Christ, this was long enough, full long enough, to prove the use of water-baptism before the abolition of circumcision, and, consequently, that the former neither was, nor could have been substituted in the room of the latter.—Aye, but does the Doctor think that John’s baptism was *christian baptism* ? If he does, how was it that the number of the disciples and their names (even after their ascension) was only about a hundred and twenty ? How, indeed ! But does Mr. *Mayo* then imagine that the Evangelist, in Acts i, 15, includes the whole number of Christ’s disciples ? If so,—what can be the meaning of John iv, 1, compared with chap. iii, 22, 26, where it is said that Jesus (that is, by the ministry of his apostles) both made and baptized more disciples than John ? Or was not Christ seen after his resurrection of above 500 brethren at once ?——But, after all, it will be difficult to prove, that even John’s baptism was not equivalent to *christian baptism*. For himself
 hath

hath informed us, in John i, 31, that the design of his baptizing with water was to notify the appearance of the Messiah to the house of *Israel*. Accordingly, the subject of his preaching was not only repentance towards God, but faith in Christ. See John i, *passim* and John iii, 36,—but particularly Acts xix, 4, 5, where Paul is introduced as saying to the twelve disciples,—“ John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should *believe* on him which should come after him; that is, on Christ Jesus. And when they (the people to whom John preached) heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.” For it is sufficiently evident that verse the 5th is only a continuation of the speech of the apostle *Paul*, not merely from the connection, but from the use of the particles *μεν* and *δε*; the latter being never joined with a participle to begin a paragraph when the former immediately precedes it. This, at least, is the opinion of *Beza*, *Bockart*, *Drusius*, *Grotius*, *Guise*, *Pool's Continuation*, &c. We might farther enquire, who baptized the twelve apostles, or the hundred and twenty disciples above-mentioned? It is plain, from John i, 35, 40, that *Andrew* was one of the disciples of *John*, and the same is probable of his brother *Peter* and their townsman *Philip*, and yet we no where find that they were ever afterwards *rebaptized*; on the contrary, in John iv, 2, we are informed, that Christ himself baptized no one. Nor can we easily support the pertinence of Christ's observing in Acts i, 5, that John truly baptized with water; unless we suppose that the only water-baptism the apostles had was that of John. We may add, that Christ's submitting, as he did, to the same baptism,

tism, which baptism it is to be hoped will be allowed to be christian baptism, together with his answer to *John* will favour the opinion advanced. In the last place, the eloquent *Apollos*, though a christian teacher, is expressly said to have known no other baptism, see Acts. xviii, 25. Accordingly it is the sentiment of several learned Pædo-baptists that those believers who had been baptized by *John* were never afterwards rebaptized. See *Guise* on the fore-cited Acts, xix. 4, 5.

But, dropping this point, the apostles themselves, even before their master's death, baptized many. Was *their* baptism then equivalent to christian baptism? If it was, even christian baptism (or a baptism which was very---very much like it) was used and administered *three years* before circumcision was abolished. The reader, indeed, may object, if he pleases, that *three years* are not *three hundred*. But wherefore should this dishearten us? If our *champion* hath fallen, his antagonist hath been kind enough to raise him up again, and very generously returned him his sword. Baptism, says Mr. *Mayo*, was used and administered *many centuries of years* before *John* the baptist was born; for by this external rite the Jews were wont to receive their *profelytes*---men, women, --- and --- oh! fatal unexpected blow, --- even CHILDREN! Alas! what is become of our hero's clemency now! verily, he hath raised his antagonist from the ground---*only* that he might have the honor to strike him down again. But how does he know that this was the custom of the Jews? Why, *Maimonides*, whom it is to be hoped the Doctor hath read, *if not*
in

*in hebrew, yet in latin,** (which by the by, may be more than every M. A. is capable of doing),---*Maimonides* hath exprefsly told us fo; ---and other *cabalistical* and *talmudical* writers (*the doctōrs favorite companions, his chief oracles*) have said fo too. What a pity that the Doctor's companions should prove fo treacherous! as to the *Babylonian Talmud*, however, in which mention is said to be made of this baptism, according to *Buxtorff*, it was not compleated till the end of the *fifth century*; and as to *Maimonides*, his testimony is still weaker; for he did not flourish till the very middle of the 12th. century. What credit, [^] can he lend to a ceremony which is said to have been practised about *eleven hundred years* before he was born? ~~and~~ *Rabbi Mayo* may be as good a witness of what he hath never seen as *Rabbi Maimonides*; for my part I would as soon admit the evidence of the one as of the other,

*the
mitted
X*

But what shall we say of this Jewish Baptism when some of the *Jewish Rabbies* themselves have questioned the truth of it?† When one affirms it and another denies it? When neither the *Misnah* nor *Philo Judæus*, nor even *Josephus*, though he writes professedly on the customs and antiquities of his countrymen hath ~~not~~ so much as mentioned it? We must say that if infant baptism hath no better support than this, (and some persons have made it the principal support) it is built upon a weak and a very crazy foundation. Our author, then may attempt to *frighten us*, if he pleases, with the names of a *Lightfoot*, a *Selden*, a *Grotius*, &c.

* Page 44.

† Vid. Gale's Reflections on Wall's history of Infant-baptism. Page 330, &c.

&c, who have read authors which *he*, it may be, hath never seen, or even heard of ; but he must for once forgive the baptists, if they will not suffer themselves to be *terrified* out of their reason by the popular and venerable whimsies of fallible men. The Jews of our Saviour's time appear themselves to have considered baptism as a *novel* custom, since they disputed *John's* authority to practise it, unless he could prove himself to be either the Christ, or Elias, or the greatest prophet. See *John* i. 25. Accordingly, in verse the 33d. he does not excuse himself by mentioning the ceremony as a common practice, but openly declares that he baptized by a divine commission. To the same purpose see *Mark* xi. 30, and *Luke* 7, 29, 30 ; from whence it will appear that baptism (that is *initiatory* baptism) was not an old but a new ceremony,—a ceremony of *divine appointment*, and at first peculiar to *John*, who for that reason, and no other, was called the *baptist*.—As to the washings or purifications under the law, which our author hath urged to support his hypothesis by referring us to *Numb.* xv, 15, 16, let me ask him for whom, and for what end, those washings were appointed ? Were they not for such as were actually members of the jewish church ; and to be observed, only in cases of *legal* uncleanness ? It is true, indeed, that *one ordinance, one law, and one manner* was to serve for the Jews and for the stranger who sojourned among them. But it is also equally true, that the stranger and all his males were to be previously circumcised, and thus become members of the visible church. We farther know (as our author says) that the Gentiles were always considered and stiled by the Jews *unclean* ;

clean ; but a little reflection might convince us that they could never have been considered and treated as proper subjects of any *legal* purification, till they had been first circumcised and subjected to the Jewish law. Besides, the washings in question were not to be performed by the priests, but by the parties themselves who were to be purified. If, therefore, proselytes were to be thus admitted, they must be supposed to have admitted *themselves*—not *half-way* (as it seems the eunuch did under the gospel) but, *wholly* and *altogether*.

But the reader, perhaps, will ask me, to what purpose is all this wrangling and jangling about the baptism of the Jewish proselytes. Mr. *Mayo* hath informed him in page the 45th. —“ Now, says he, as our Lord adopted this
 “ rite of washing or baptism, for initiating
 “ members into his church ; — is it not rea-
 “ sonable to suppose he would have it applied
 “ to the same subjects, parents and their child-
 “ ren, as was the custom of the Jews for cen-
 “ turies before ? Or if he had intended to ex-
 “ clude *children*, would he not have given a
 “ *prohibition*, that his apostles might not have
 “ acted according to the *common usage* of the
 “ Jews, and the church of God in past ages ;
 “ you must excuse me, if I say, *he certainly*
 “ *would* : But did he in his great commission
 “ to them. Matt· xxviii, 19 ? By no means, &c.”
 —But in the first place, good reader, it is highly probable from what hath been already said that this Jewish baptism is a *Jewish fable*, an *ens rationis*, a meer *chimera* ; — and, in the next place, even supposing it to have been as ancient and as general a practice as our reverend *antiquarian* would have it to be,—what
 advantage

advantage will he gain by it? Was it a divine institution? Or is it any where commanded or even *mentioned* in any of the inspired writings? In *Exod.* xii. 48, 49. the admission of proselytes is particularly specified. But is there a word about their baptism? If not, it must have been a meer tradition, an ordinance of the jewish scribes; and, consequently, the apostles must have been very weak, or very unmindful of their master's directions, if they had baptized infants only to imitate their superstitious countrymen, and comply with a ceremony of barely human invention.* Besides, even before the crucifixion of the Messiah, the apostles themselves had administered baptism to many hundreds,—a baptism in which infants had no concern; and, consequently they could never afterwards have altered their practice, and considered children as proper subjects of baptism, without a command for it.

Mr. Mayo, indeed, hath assured us that *the very words of the apostle's commission include children.*† He means, I suppose, that children are *a part of all nations.* But so are servants and slaves; and so are the wicked and profane as well as the righteous. It is therefore evident that the phrase must be *definite*, and only used in a *limited* sense; in the same manner as *πᾶσιν τῇ κτίσει* every creature in Mark xvi, 15. But from whence must we take the limitation? Undoubtedly from the passage itself. “Go, “ says our Lord, *and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*” From hence it follows,

* Our Lord hath inveighed very severely, in several places, against the traditions of the Jews, and particularly against their baptisms or washings.

ows, that the proper subjects of baptism were *such as had been taught*. Accordingly it is said in *Mark*, upon the same occasion, *he who believes and is baptized*. It may, perhaps, be alledged—and, indeed, it commonly is alledged—that our Lord is speaking only of the baptism of *adult persons*. Is he so? What right, then, hath Mr. *Mayo*, or any man else, to talk of the baptism of any *other* sort of persons? Shall we presume to *add* to the institution of Christ? Or shall we look upon it as deficient, and not so plain and explicit as it ought to have been? God forbid! It is true, indeed, our Lord hath not *expressly prohibited* the baptism of infants. But it is equally true, that *positive* laws must, in all cases, carry their *negative* along with them. When the Israelites were ordered to circumcise their *males*, they readily concluded they were not to circumcise their *females*. In the same manner, if Christ, hath commanded that those who *believe* should be baptized, we may rationally infer that those who are *not believers* (or whom we have no reason to consider as such) should not be admitted to baptism.—But Mr. *Mayo*, I suppose, will tell us, that a command for the baptism of infants would have been *superfluous*; because, “if Christ had intended to *exclude* them, he “would have given a prohibition that his “apostles might not have acted according to “the *common usage* of the Jews, and the church “of God in past ages;”* since it is certain “that the *children* of the Jewish proselytes were *incorporated with them and became of the household of God*. But is not this acknowledging in effect, that there is *no precept* for the baptism

baptism of infants, and that *the very words of the apostles commission do not include them*? Besides, even the argument itself is insufficient; for we have already taken notice that the *mosaic* or Jewish church was a *national* one, which is not the case with the christian church.--- This will furnish out an answer to our author's question in page the 45th.---a question by which he doubtless imagined that he should stagger the faith of his antagonists. "Suppose our Lord, says he, had not changed the rite, but ordered his disciples to go disciple all nations, circumcising them in the name of the Father &c. would they not have thought themselves directed to circumcise the *children* of christian proselytes or believers, as well as the parents, if not every male of the family?" Now, here, good reader, we have a pinching query with a witness! what then shall we do with it? Or how shall we loose and unravel this *Gordian* knot? Verily by proposing *another* question which, it may be, will be altogether as puzzling.—Supposing then, that no command, no precept, had ever been given for the circumcision of children (which is precisely the case with respect to baptism;) and supposing farther that the *jewish* church was not a national one, (which is precisely the case with the *christian* church;)---supposing, I say, that under these circumstances, that ten or a dozen of the Jewish priests had been dispatched, some into one country and some into another, with these orders, "go and preach to all nations the true religion, circumcising them in the name of the true God;" would they or could they have thought themselves directed, in this case, to circumcise children

ren with their parents? We may safely and boldly answer *no, they would not.*

But if we add, not only that there is *no command* for the baptism of infants, and that the christian church is *not a national one* like the jewish,---if we add, I say, what we have before observed, that the apostles themselves had already practised a baptism in which infants had neither part nor concern; what can be more improbable than that they should baptize them afterwards, under the *gospel*, merely because they were used to be circumcised under the *law*?

Let us next enquire whether baptism comes in the room of circumcision; for this also hath been asserted in order to convince us that children have as great a right to the former as they had to the latter.* But let it here be remembered that the jewish converts thought otherwise; for, notwithstanding their baptism, it is a matter of fact, that they still contended for the continuance of circumcision. Nay, so great was their zeal for it, that they would have persuaded even the believing *Gentiles* to have been circumcised as well as themselves. It is also remarkable that the apostle *Paul*, where he endeavours professedly to prove the nullity of circumcision, hath never done it by representing baptism as coming in the room of it. We may add that it will be difficult to give a reason why the apostles should have permitted the use of circumcision among the believing Jews, as they manifestly did,—or to account for the circumcision of Timothy, even after his baptism,---if we suppose the latter ordinance to be substituted in the room of the former;

mer ; for this, in effect, would have been to be circumcised or baptized twice over, which you please. It is, indeed, pretended that in *Col. ii. 11, 12.* the apostle hath evidently supported the notion. -- “ For the apostle’s argument, it “ seems, according to *common sense*, is, that “ as baptism represents and seals the same blessings, as did circumcision ; therefore it was “ needless for christians to be partakers of circumcision, especially as Christ’s circumcision “ had put an end to that ceremony, and they “ were baptized into him, and one with him.”* But, in the first place, circumcision is no where mentioned as a *seal*† either of temporal or spiritual blessings,---neither is baptism. In the next place, the apostle is speaking in the verses referred to, not of *jewish* but only of *spiritual* circumcision, the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ---that is, the circumcision which Christ requires.

It is plain, then, that the Passage is merely allusive, and that the allusion is not between circumcision and baptism, but between the circumcision made *with hands*, and that which is made *without hands*. Christians are subjects of the latter, and therefore have no occasion for the former ;‡ as is manifest from their baptism, in

* Page 46.

† To Abraham, indeed, it is said to have been a *seal*. (See *Rom. iv. 11.*) But of what ? Why of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised ; that is, it was a proof or confirmation of the *goodness* or *sincerity* of his faith. How ? Because it was an instance, a striking instance, of his ready and implicit obedience to the will of God.

‡ If it should be asked, what occasion then had the *Jews* for circumcision any more than *Christians*, since the one had as much need of *spiritual* circumcision as the others can have:---

in which they profess themselves, not as bound to submit to the law and its ritual observances, but, *as buried and risen again together with Christ* as the great end of the law for righteousness to all who believe. The Apostle therefore hath argued for the abolition of circumcision, not from baptism itself as coming in the room of it, but from that inward circumcision of the heart which confers a *right* to baptism, and of which those who are baptized should make profession. So that, in fact, the passage before us might be urged not *for* but *against* the pædobaptists; because it discovers that the subjects of baptism should at least *appear* to be what infants *cannot appear* to be,—that is, to be circumcised with the circumcision of Christ, or christian circumcision, in putting off the body of the sins of corrupted nature. Besides, under the law, not only the sons, but all the *male-servants* of the jewish householders were to be circumcised,—and only such; for all the *females* were excluded. Now what shall we infer from this? Doubtless, even supposing that christian baptism came in the room of circumcision, we must infer that the substitution extended *not to the subjects*, but only to the *end and design* of the two ordinances,—the establishment of *proper and appointed members* in the visible church.

But let us hasten to the next argument. This is borrowed from 1 Cor. vii. 14;* and, it seems, is such a striking one, that if there were no more in the New Testament, it would be a sufficient authority for ministers to receive children into
E
their

I answer, because the *former* were to be distinguished; by some *permanant* sign or token, as members of a *national* church, which is not the case with the *latter*.

their Lord's church by baptism. But alas! wonderfully plain and striking as the argument is, it is notorious that several learned Pædobaptists have disowned the force of it. *Musculus*, who once employed it against the baptists with great virulence, hath frankly acknowledged that it hath no concern with the controversy, and that his former explanation of the passage was entirely groundless.—Aye, says our author, but were not the marriages of heathens as lawful as those of christians? Yes, they certainly were. Will it not follow, then, that the marriage of a believer and a pagan is as lawful as that of two believers? It is equally so, beyond dispute. But, nevertheless, it is sufficiently plain from the context that many of the Corinthians thought otherwise, or, at least, had not the happiness to be so well satisfied about the matter as Mr. *Mayo* is. They had requested the apostle's advice (see v. 1.) concerning things which to them appeared doubtful; and, in answer to this he informs them, among other particulars, that a believer is far from being obliged by the gospel to separate from an unbelieving yoke-fellow. For, as he tells them in the verse before us, *the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband*;--- that is, the unbeliever is really sanctified to the use of the believer, so far that they may lawfully cohabit as man and wife, notwithstanding the difference of their spiritual and religious characters. Otherwise, says he, *your children* (that is, those already born) *are unclean*, or illegitimate; whereas, in fact, they are by you esteemed and really *are holy*—legitimate and lawfully begotten. He reasons with them upon their own principles. “ If you
“ can

“ can believe that your *children* are *holy*, and
 “ love and cherish them as your lawful pro-
 “ geny,---wherefore should you separate, ye
 “ wives from your husbands, or ye husbands
 “ from your wives, for not submitting to the
 “ same faith as yourselves? If your *children* are
 “ legitimate, your *husbands* and your *wives* must
 “ be so too; but if the latter are not legitimate,
 “ neither are your *children*. Since, therefore,
 “ ye will not scruple to consider your *children*
 “ as legitimate, it would be a real and a mani-
 “ fest contradiction to suppose otherwise of their
 “ parents.” View the passage in this light, and
 it appears sensible and connected: the apostle
 argues from the acknowledged legitimacy of
 their offspring, to the full legitimacy of their
 marriage.—We might add, as a farther con-
 firmation of our opinion, that the word *sancti-*
fied is frequently used by the Jews for being
lawfully married, or espoused. See Dr. Gill on
 the passage in question. If, therefore, to be
 made *holy* when applied to the *unbelieving* pa-
 rent, means a civil, or matrimonial holiness;
 (for it is certain, as well from the connection,
 as from common reason, that no other holiness
 can be intended) why should not *holy* be likewise
 taken in a *civil* sense, and mean *legitimate* when
 it is applied to the children?---especially when it
 is used of both parties, not only in the same
 paragraph, but in the same sentence?---“ But
 “ suppose, says our author, it had been said to
 “ the Jews, that though one party should be
 “ *unclean*, or a Gentile, yet, if the other was
 “ a Jew, their children would be *holy*; would
 “ not every one among them immediately have
 “ understood what was meant, even that the
 “ children were peculiarly related to God &c.

“and accordingly have circumcised them?” I answer, it is very probable they would. But wherefore? Why, because they knew from their sacred law, that all their legitimate offspring were to be considered as members of the national church, and that, for this reason, they were expressly commanded to circumcise them. But is the christian church a national church? and doth legitimacy of birth constitute the members of this, as it did of the Jewish? Or is there any command for the baptism of infants under the gospel? If not, the case is widely different.

As to Rom. xi. 16, 17,* which hath been urged as another proof of the right of infants to baptism; this is far from proving, as our author would have it, that the jewish and the christian church are the same, and consequently that both the members and the privileges of the members in each should be so too. For the apostle is not speaking of the Jews under the Mosaic dispensation, but, only of those who had outlived it, and were his own cotemporaries, and as such were no longer members of a national church any more than the Gentiles. In the next place, it is sufficiently plain from the general tenor of the apostle's argument, that by the *root* and the *branches* he does not intend believing parents and their children; but those jewish converts who were the first fruits, and as it were the root of christianity, and such of their posterity, as, at the time appointed, should be called in to embrace the faith of the gospel. It is also manifest from verse the 20th that the *unholy* branches (or branches who were broken off) were actual *unbelievers*, while the branches who should be grafted in were actual *believers*,---and,

and, consequently, that infants are intended in neither case. *Because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest,---how?---by faith.* Aye. “but when the natural branches the Jews, (says “our author) shall again be ingrafted into their “own olive tree, the church of God, will not “their children be grafted or entered with “them?” * Doubtless, says he, they will; and refers us to Jer. xxx. 20, 22. *Their children also shall be established as aforetime &c.* But so far is the prophet from intending the happy and the glorious event in question, that he only refers to the return of the Jews and their children from their captivity in *Babylon*,---an event which was considerably prior to the abolition of the Old Testament church. Let the reader judge, then, from what hath been said, whether the children of Christians are declared by *inspiration* to be *fœderally holy* and as standing in a *peculiar visible relation to God*.

The next argument alledged against us is deduced from Luke xviii. 16, or Matt. xix. 14, which of them the Doctor pleases†. These passages it seems, have so miserably grappled and perplexed our unfortunate *champion* that he could not and cannot but say, with all his torturing, that they clearly prove *the redeemer's love to infants, and his readiness to receive and bless them*. Now, who would not imagine from hence that the Doctor and all his followers are *infant-baters*, and that this is the reason why they are such enemies, such inveterate and cruel enemies to *infant-baptism*. “Yes, verily, says “our author, knowing a little what parental “affection is, I cannot but think that *he* (the “Doctor) *is destitute of it*; or bigotry forces

E 3

“ him

“ him to say and unsay, just to serve his own
 “ turn*.” Well spoken, friend *Candidus* ! This
 is charity to perfection ! The Doctor is either
 a monster of inhumanity, or a most pre-
 varicating shuffler !---But come, let us for the
 present divest ourselves of our unnatural and worse
 than *Scythian barbarity*. Let us throw off the
 giant and assume the air of social beings. Chil-
 dren, then, we say, *are capable of divine blessings*,
 ---properly and truly so.---But what of that ?
 Why, “ really, Sir, says Mr. *Mayo*, those
 “ whom Christ took up in his arms and blessed,
 “ or that are capable of divine blessing, I should
 “ be afraid to cast out of his church, and assert
 “ they have no right to be received into it.”
 Mighty well ! But how did Christ bless them ?
 If we may judge from the context in Matthew,
he prayed for them; and it is said of Christ that
him the father beareth always. It is therefore
 more than probable that whatever blessings he
 prayed for were afterwards very plentifully be-
 stowed upon them. But were these blessings of
 a temporal or a spiritual nature ? if they were
 merely temporal, and only regarded the health
 of their bodies, or their prosperity in future
 life, the argument will prove too much. It
 will prove that not only *wicked* men as well
 as the *righteous*, and *infidels* as well as be-
 lievers, but that even *sheep, lambs, or doves*,
 should be devoutly baptized ; since all the crea-
 tures of the great father of the universe are up-
 held by his watchful care, and more or less re-
 joice in his unwearied bounty and compassion as
 the God of providence

Mr. *Mayo*, indeed, hath exclaimed, “ if
 “ these children were diseased, and so brought
 “ to

“ to Christ to be cured (as the Doctor sup-
 “ poses)—what monsters must the apostles *be*
 “ to reject and endeavour to put them and their
 “ tender mothers away, when they knew that
 “ a touch of their master’s hand, or a word
 “ from his lips would have cured them and
 “ preserved their lives!”* But how hath he
 mended the matter? For if he supposes that
 the children were brought to have a *spiritual*
 blessing pronounced upon them by the lips of
 him who could never bless in vain;—if he sup-
 poses this, he will give the apostles a far worse
 character than the Doctor hath. What! art
 thou a master in Israel, and hast it yet to learn
 that *spiritual* blessings are far more weighty than
temporal ones,—even as much so as the impor-
 tance of eternity outweighs the lightness of
 time? If, therefore, you would look upon it
 as a barbarous action to hinder children from
 receiving *bodily* advantage,—what must we call
 it when they are forbidden to be brought to
 Jesus, the compassionate Jesus, to receive spi-
 ritual and eternal advantages? Verily, friend
Mayo, thou hast reminded me of the charitable
 priest in the fable, who, though unwilling to
 part with a farthing, out of his pocket, was
 very ready to bestow his blessings,—thus shew-
 ing that he thought the former to be of more
 value than the latter.

But after all, even supposing that the chil-
 dren in question received not *corporal* but *spiritual*
 blessings;—is this any proof that we ought to
 have baptized not only *them*, but *all other chil-*
dren too? *These*, we will suppose, could not
 fail of becoming true believers as they grew up
 and arrived to years of discretion. But shall we

E 4

say

say the same of every other infant? If not, the case is widely different.—Besides, we are no where informed that either Christ or his apostles baptized even the very children to whom he gave his blessing; and yet we are certain that the apostles baptized numbers. But had they been used to administer baptism to infants, it is highly improbable, in the first place, that they would have forbidden them to be brought to their master at all, and, in the next place, that they would have neglected to baptize them immediately, when Jesus had blessed them. If Mr. Mayo had been there he would doubtless have sprinkled them forthwith. But the apostles were not so much in a hurry;—knowing, it is likely, that faith and repentance are indispensable prerequisites to baptism,—that is, that no person should be baptized, who, in the judgment of charity, is not possessed of both.

But let us look at the argument again, and examine it carefully and attentively on every side. “*If children are capable of spiritual blessings, they are also capable of baptism.*” Now this must mean, either that a *meer capacity to receive* such blessings will give a right to baptism; or, on the other hand, we must understand it of persons who appear to have *actually received* them. If a *meer capacity* will do the business, we must take in not only *all infants*, but *all the world*: for *all* have an undoubted capacity to *receive* spiritual blessings, on whom the Almighty is willing to bestow them. But if baptism is to be confined to those who may appear to have *actually received* such blessings, ---what will become of the baptism of infants? ---This will furnish us with an answer to what
our

our author hath farther alledged. After telling us that our Lord hath declared that of *such* (he means of *infants*) is the kingdom of heaven, and that, if we please, we may understand the kingdom of glory, he puts the question, “if infants are members of the *invisible* church, why not of the *visible*?” Truly, Sir, because you have not yet informed us, *what* infants are members of the *former*. You will not say that *all* infants are so;—no, not *all* the infants of *believers*. Perhaps, then, you will extend the privilege to all who die in their childhood. But, how are these to be distinguished from the rest? Can you open the book of fate, and read the length and the number of their days? Can you measure the mystic span of life, and say *that* child shall become a man, but *this* child shall be carried from the cradle to the grave? If not, you must give us leave to defer the admission of an infant into the *visible* church, till we can judge whether he is a member of the *invisible*; that is, till he grows to years of discretion; for then, and not till then, can he *appear* to belong to the kingdom of heaven. The Doctor, therefore; hath very rationally inferred—“that the
 “ church of Christ, under the gospel, is not
 “ national but congregational, consisting of men
 “ gathered out of the world by the grace of
 “ God, and who make a public profession of
 “ Christ; which infants are not capable of,
 “ and so cannot be real subjects of it.” This you treat as a very laughable account. But how have you proved it to be so? Truly, by asking the question, why the Doctor hath not mentioned *women* as well as *men*? Wherefore, then, did he *not* mention them? Doubtless,

less, because he never dreamt that he should have to deal with a *quibbler*,—I say a *quibbler*; for no one else, who knows (as you do) that he baptizes *women* as well as *men*, would ever have insinuated that he rejects *women* as well as *children*. But, to carry on the joke, you have referred us to Gal. iii, 28. to prove what? Why, that *women* should be admitted into the church as well as *men*,—or, in other words, to prove what nobody denies. O *Mayo, Mayo*, what idle trumpery is this!

But come, let us take notice of the Doctor's *other reply*, or of his *next solution of the text*. This, however, *should be overlooked for the Doctor's sake!* “for,—strange! though our “Lord declares *totidem verbis* (in so many “words) that *of infants* is the kingdom of “heaven; he, contrary-wise, affirms, in fact, “they themselves are not intended, but only “*such as they*” &c. Well spoken, Mr. *Positive!* You have hampered us most sweetly! But, hold! let us turn to the passage itself. Pray, then, gentle Sir, what *version* did you consult? Or did you peep into the original Greek? the original says *τοιςτοις* *of such*:—most of the *Latin* versions say *talium*, *of such*:—the *Syriac* says, *illorum qui sunt sicut isti*, *such who are like them*, that is, like children: and the *English* version says *of such*. O bigotry, O prejudice, how wonderful is your power! Ye can even bewitch the faculty of sight, and by your enchantment make us *read and see*, what is no where to be either seen or read!

But let us proceed. “According to the “Doctor's explanation of Christ's words, and “conduct, (says our author) had *sheep, lambs,* “or *doves* been brought to him, he might
“ have

“ have been *angry with his disciples*, for for-
 “ bidding the bearers to come near and present
 “ them ; and have not only said, *suffer them*
 “ *to be brought*, but have also *taken them into*
 “ *his arms, laid his hands upon them and blessed*
 “ *them* ; and then pronounced *that of such as*
 “ *they*, (who are comparable to them for temper,
 “ meekness, &c.) is the kingdom of heaven :
 “ *risum teneatis amice !* (that is, O friend laugh
 ye merrily at this !)” aye, truly, laugh indeed!
 for this is certainly a very merry conceit ! If
children are humble, so are *sheep* ; if *children*
 are meek, so are *lambs* ; if *children* are harm-
 less, so are *doves* ;—ergo, when *children* were
 brought to Christ to receive his blessing, it is
 a wonder of wonders that he compared the
 subjects of the kingdom of heaven, not to
sheep and *lambs*, and *doves*, but to *children*,—
 because the latter, forsooth, were presented to
 him, and the others were not :—though by
 the by, if *sheep*, and *lambs*, and *doves* had been
 before him, he might, and, upon other occa-
 sions, actually did represent them as fitting
 emblems of what his followers *ought* to be,
 —obedient, meek, and harmless.

But again, in Mr. Mayo’s opinion, “ there is
 “ no just connection between Christ’s displeasure
 “ at his disciples for keeping *infants* from him,
 “ and giving as the reason of it, that *not to them*,
 “ but to grown persons, *quite different subjects*,
 “ his kingdom belonged.” Now, here, let me
 ask the reader one question ; and a very fair one
 it is. What was the reason why the apostles
 would have rejected the children we are speaking
 of ? To make the best of it, and give the apos-
 tles as favourable a character as we can, we will
 suppose, not as our author does, that they were
 brought

brought for *spiritual* blessings, but that they were only presented for the cure of *bodily* infirmities. Wherefore, then, would the apostles have been their hindrance? From motives of cruelty? Let us hope *not*; but rather because many persons of riper years were then waiting to be healed;—or, it may be, they thought the children would be troublesome. This, however, at the bottom, was nothing but pride,—a weakness to which the best of men are subject; for as the brightest day hath seldom passed without a cloud, so the wisest and the holiest of mortals have their frailties and imperfections. The apostles must have thought that *adult* persons (such as themselves) had, or ought to have, the preference before *children*, as well in the sight of God as in the sight of man;—otherwise, wherefore should children have been neglected? But did our Lord encourage their vanity? So far from it, that he not only took up the children and blessed them, but assured his disciples that; of *such as they*, i. e. of persons who had as little notion of their own importance and personal merit as infants have, is the kingdom of heaven. Accordingly, said he, *Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child*, (with the same meekness and humility, and with as little opinion of his own worth and significance) *shall in no wise enter therein*.—Are the words and conduct of Christ, in this view of them, really pertinent and connected, or are they not? Mr. Mayo, perhaps, will still answer in the negative; but several learned Pædobaptists have thought otherwise, and Calvin among the rest. As to Matt. xviii, 6, 10, and Mark ix, 36, 37, compared with Luke xvii, 1, 2, it is sufficiently evident that the *little ones* there mentioned

tioned are not to be taken in a *literal* sense, but signify true disciples; because they are said expressly to be such who *believe in Christ*. Aye, says our author, “ but why did God command “ infants to be admitted of old, and continued “ them in his visible church *thousands of years*? “ Why did not *Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses,* “ *the prophets and jewish priests,* argue as Dr. “ *Gill*; and of their own head, *without divine “ authority,* exclude them? Truly, because they “ modestly reflected that God excelled them in “ wisdom, and well knew who were the most “ proper subjects of his own church, &c.”——

That is, we may suppose, because they were modest enough *to do as they were ordered,* and administer a ceremony to their children which was expressly and very strictly enjoined. Now one would imagine, from hence, that infant-baptism is a *divine institution*, and that there is a plain and a positive order for it in the gospel. Otherwise, the case is widely different. But where is this order to be met with? Or in what part of the gospel shall we find it? If no where, who is most discreet? Who most humble and respectful? Who best imitates the pious modesty of *Abraham, of Moses,* and the prophets? The man who practiseth what God hath ordered him to practise? Or the man who adds to his maker’s command, and renders a service which he hath no where required? Besides, as we have already observed, the jewish church was a national one, and, as such, included all who were born into the nation; but the christian church is purely a spiritual one, and should therefore be confined to those who are born of the spirit,—or, at least, who *appear* to be so.——“ But the Doctor himself acknowledges, says *Mr. Mayo*, the necessity

“ sity of infants being regenerated, before they
 “ can enter the kingdom of glory : must he not
 “ then either damn all that die in childhood, or
 “ maintain that some are born again of the spi-
 “ rit : but if of the *spirit*, why not of *water* ? ”

Why, indeed ! Truly, because no one can fore-
 tell *what infants* will leave the world in their
 childhood, and who will not : and as to those
 who may live, it is alike uncertain, not only
 which of them *are*, or whether *any* of them are,
 but which of them ever *will* be born of the spi-
 rit. One would therefore imagine, that upon
 this footing it would be much the wiser way to
 defer their baptism till they grow to years of dis-
 cretion : for as to those who die in their infancy,
 their want of baptism can be no prejudice to
 their salvation ; and as to those who live, their
 character will naturally open and unfold itself as
 they advance in years.

I have dwelt the longer upon this argument,
 because *Candidus* appears to be fond of it, and
 to look upon it as the capital support of his
 cause. To me, however, it wears a different
 aspect ; and when I consider the air of confi-
 dence and triumph with which he hath mention-
 ed it, and the weakness and incapacity with
 which he hath managed it, I must compare his
 disappointed readers to the men in the fable.
 There, it seems, as they were standing upon the
 sea-shore, imagined, at first, that they disco-
 vered a ship at a distance hulling towards them :
 but, as the waves drove it nearer, it appeared
 less, and dwindled first into a barge, and soon
 after into a small wherry, till, at last, it was
 found to be nothing more than *a heap of weeds* !

Our author's next argument is from Acts ii,
 39, *For the promise is to you and your children,*
and

and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. This promise, in Mr. Mayo's opinion, is the same as the promise and blessings in the covenant with *Abraham*. But if we may judge from the connection, it was rather the promise in *Joel*, or the promise which Christ had received of the Father, even the promise of the Holy Ghost:—see verse the 38th compared with verses 16, 17, and the 33d. It was farther a promise only to such as should repent, and be baptized in the name of Christ for the remission of sins;—see verse the 38th, and therefore can only extend to the *adult*. We are told, indeed, that it was made to the Jews *and their children*; but *you and your children*, is nothing more than *you and your posterity*, as appears not only from this use of the word *children* in other passages, but from the limitation expressed in the text. For, if there is any meaning in words, the promise belongs neither to the Jews nor their children, nor to those afar off (that is the *Gentiles*) but only to such of them who believe. Wherefore else was it added, *even to as many as the Lord our God shall call*?—We may farther observe, that the very practice of the apostles, on this occasion, is a plain intimation that the words before us had no sort of reference to infants. For who were to receive the Holy Ghost, or the promise in question? Those who had been *baptized*: see verse the 38th. Who then were baptized? Those who had *gladly received the words of Peter*, see verse the 41st: and these, after their baptism, continued stedfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers; see verse the 42d. Can this be supposed of *children*? Besides, if *you and your children* means *you and your infants*, how naturally

naturally would it have followed, in verse the 41st, “ then they that gladly received the word “ were baptized *together with their children.*” But the baptism of their children is not so much as hinted; on the contrary, it is manifestly excluded by the very turn of the expression. Let the reader judge from hence, whether the Doctor’s exposition of the passage in question is so frivolous, *that it hardly agrees with common sense.* Drs. *Whitby* and *Hammond*, though Pædobaptists, and it is to be hoped as good judges of common sense as Mr. *Mayo*, have thought the passage to have no concern with mere infants, and consequently to be no argument for their baptism.—As to our author’s out-of-the-way query, “ What advantage had the Jew, or the “ *Gentile believer of old*; or what advantage “ hath the Christian now, either *parent or child*, “ above the *Ethiopian* or the *Indian savage*,” supposing the promise not to concern infants, I may well excuse myself from answering:—for, to speak the truth, I cannot discover his meaning, unless it be that it is no advantage to be born under the sound of the gospel, and to have parents who can instruct us in the christian faith. If this is his opinion, he is highly welcome to reap the honour of it.

His next endeavour is to reply to the Doctor’s objection, “ that if infants are real members “ of the church, they must have an equal “ right to the Lord’s supper as to baptism, of “ which they are equally capable.” But how does he reply? Your champion, says he; will inform you that one ordinance *initiates* into the Church, and the other *establisbes*. Now, supposing this to be true, let me ask the reader,—not only the cool and impartial, but even the warm

warm and the prejudiced reader,---let me ask him in the name of reason and common sense, whether it is not as vain, as ridiculous, and as absurd to *initiate* or *admit* a person into he knows not what, as to *establish* him in he knows not what? O prejudice, O bigotry, speak out and deny it if ye can.---But, to proceed, the Lord's supper, he says, *establishes*. Now supposing that he is not mistaken, and that the real design of the Lord's supper was to *establish* or *confirm* persons, not so much in faith and holiness, but as approved members of the visible church; supposing this, I say, let us ask the question,---*at what time* does it establish? Truly when the subject is old enough to partake of it, that is, when he hath *proper capacity* so to do. But does he mean a *natural*, or an *implanted* capacity? If only a natural capacity, how happens it that all those who are baptized in their infancy are not received forthwith as lawful communicants, when they discover such a capacity, that is, as soon as they can reason and think? But if he means an *implanted* or a *spiritual* capacity (such as faith, love, repentance, &c) he requires a capacity which the greatest part of those infants who are baptized will never have!---Besides, after all, it is certain that the infants of believers have as good a spiritual capacity for the Lord's supper as the *children of the Jews* had to partake of the passover: if, therefore, the latter succeeds the former in the same manner as baptism (it is pretended) comes in the room of circumcision, why should not the partakers be the same in both cases, that is, *children with their parents*? But, to come to the point, it will be owned, I suppose, that baptism and the supper are equally ordinances of the gospel-church: it must likewise be farther

acknowledged that repentance and faith are as expressly required for the one as they are for the other: nor can it be denied that, in the New Testament-history, the two ordinances are so nearly conjoined that those who were admitted to baptism were always admitted to the supper without a scruple. I might add that this was *the constant and universal practice of the church* in the first ages. By what authority then would Mr. Mayo, or any one else, put the ordinances so far asunder? So far that in *many*, and indeed in *most cases*, the one is *never* known to follow the other? As they are both ordinances of the *same church*, they should both extend to the *same persons*, and what is a reason either to give or withhold the *supper*, should be the same with respect to *baptism*. No, truly says our author, "for I could almost appeal to yourself (that is to his anti-pædobaptist correspondent, whether *real* or *fictitious* I cannot tell) I could almost appeal to yourself, whether the *natural idea* which the word *baptism* conveys, is not *passive*; that of *water's being applied to the body*, and not the body's being applied or plunged into the water; but in the supper, the *word of God* requires those who partake of it, to be *active*." He means, I suppose, that the subjects of baptism should be so *passive*, as to exercise neither faith, nor repentance, nor any grace whatever; for, unless this be his meaning, the subjects of baptism may still be as *active* as those who partake of the supper,---and, consequently, his new-fangled and truly wonderful distinction † will prove

† This, I suppose, is a *bright ray*, a *shining beam* of the *new light* which he hath reflected upon the controversy. Verily, friend Mayo, thou art not a pilfering *Planet*, shedding a light which is none of thy own, but a new and a self-enlightened *star*.

prove nothing! On the other hand, if the persons to be baptized should be *passive* in the sense we have specified, the distinction will prove too much. It will prove, not only that infants *may*, but that infants *only* (or, at least, that such *alone* who have as little faith, &c. as infants) should be admitted to baptism.

But, after all, wherefore is not the idea as truly *passive*, when the body is applied *to*, or plunged *into* the water, as when water is applied to the body? Verily, should any watry zealot seize our author and throw him headlong, or, if you please, *apply him into* a river, I am persuaded he would look upon his *body* to be altogether as *passive*, and indeed more so, than if he should be complimented with a bucket of water thrown upon him. But would his *mind* be *passive* too? No, truly, his resentment and his indignation would presently operate, and, in all likelihood, even the tongue and feet, and hands, would soon become as active as the ruffled mind. In the same manner we may speak of baptism: for though the body, whether sprinkled or plunged, is certainly passive in either case; this is no proof that the mind should be unactive also,—a consequence which our author would fain establish. In case of infants, indeed, the subject of baptism, both as to body and mind, is as passive as if it were a mere picture or a statue: for water is applied to the body, while the mind is not only ignorant of the reason wherefore, but is totally incapable even of consenting to the ceremony. A thorough *passivity* this, and doubtless a most hopeful qualification for church-membership! It is true indeed, we have no *express prohibition* of infant-baptism, but neither have we of *infant-*

communion. If therefore, to put aside the latter, it is sufficient to say, that all communicants are required to be *active* (that is, in the exercise of faith and other spiritual graces) let the same argument suffice for rejecting the former.

But I had almost forgotten *Simon Magus*. “Was not Simon, says our author, a *real* subject of the church?” He means, I suppose, not that Simon was a *real christian*, but only that he was *thought* to be so, and as such was *baptized* and received into the *visible* church. Wherefore, then, should he believe, as it seems he does, “That Dr. Gill would not chuse to say that *he* (*Simon Magus*) had an equal right to the Lord’s supper as to baptism”. What was it that gave him a right to baptism? Doubtless neither more nor less than his profession of the faith. But was this profession thought to be *sincere*? If not, he would scarcely have been baptized:—but if it was, how can we question that the same apostle who thought him entitled to *baptism*, should dispute his right to the *supper*?

But come, good Sir, as you seem to be willing to hinge the controversy on the single, and indeed the leading question,—“whether faith and repentance are scripture-prerequisites to baptism,” let us hear what you can offer to the contrary. The Doctor, you say, insisted much in his preaching, as he hath in his printed sermon, on the *order of words in scripture*. The apostles commission was, *go teach*, and having *first taught*, then *baptise them*. But the same identical Doctor, it seems, hath acknowledged upon another occasion, that *in scripture the order of things is frequently inverted*, and that

that *the Jews have a saying, that there is neither first nor last in the law.* Let us suppose, then, that this *is*, or *should* be the case, with respect to the apostles commission. They were not to teach first, and then baptize; but to baptize first, and teach afterwards. Will this satisfy you? If it will, let us proceed to draw the inference. The inference, then, will be this. whatever country or city the apostles visited, their first question to the first person they met must have been, “are you willing to be baptized? If you are, we will afterwards instruct you in the faith which you ought to profess.” Let us suppose, then, that Mr. *Mayo* himself were the person in question. “No truly, gentlemen (would he say) none of your baptism for me. I must wait till I am better acquainted with you. Inform me, in the first place, who and what you are, and give me an account of the faith you speak of; otherwise you may keep your baptism to yourselves.” If such, therefore, would have been the common and the constant reply, we may infer that *teaching* must have preceded baptism: for no person in his senses would have been baptized into any faith, or new religion, of which he was ignorant.—What then shall we say? Truly, that if the *order of words* should be inverted in *other* cases, it cannot be supposed to be so in the present. *Goliath*, therefore, may still employ the order of words as a trusty *sword*, a gallant *spear*, a noble *helmet*, and an impenetrable *coat of mail*, when he marches forth in the cause of adult baptism.

But to deal as tenderly as we can, and be as *merciful* as our boasting antagonist would seem to be, let us for once reject the *order of words*,

and only attend to the *meaning* of them. Here, then, let me ask him one question; and a very honest question it is. The commission says, *go, teach &c.* but *who* are to be taught? *All nations.* Is this a fair answer, or is it not? If it is, let me ask him, in the next place, whether *infants* can be taught? If they can, they are certainly included in the phrase *all nations.* Well, then, perhaps it will be said, infants *may* be taught. But when? Alas! when they grow to years of discretion: that is, *when they cease to be infants.* Infants, therefore, are not a part of *all nations* in the case before us:—in other words, they are not included in the apostles commission. Wherefore, then, should we have recourse to that commission to prove their *baptism*?—But, hold! hath not our hero a sling and stone as sure and fatal as the flaming sword, and the massy spear of Goliath? He certainly hath. “Infants, saith Goliath, are not
 “capable of being taught, nor of repenting
 “and believing, and therefore not to be bap-
 “tized, or admitted into the church of God.” Now this, truly, is a vaunting speech. But mark our hero’s rejoinder, and behold the deadly stone deep fixed in the giant’s haughty forehead! “Surely, says Mr. *Mayo*, they (that
 “is, christian infants) are as capable of those
 “things (viz. faith and repentance) as the Is-
 “raelite infants, who, nevertheless, were com-
 “manded to be circumcised.” Now, who would not imagine from hence, that faith and repentance were as expressly required for circumcision under the law, as they are for baptism under the gospel? Otherwise, our stripling hath missed his mark, and argued from a parallel which hath no real existence. The *Jewish*
 church,

church, as we have already observed, was purely *national*; and therefore the being born of Jewish parents was alone sufficient to entitle an Israelite to circumcision. But is the *christian* church a national one? Or can any man of common sense and common honesty, who reads the gospel, deny that faith and repentance are frequently mentioned as qualifications for baptism? What said Peter? *Repent and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ*; and accordingly, they that *gladly received his word were baptized*.* What said Philip to the eunuch? *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest*;† that is, you may be baptized into the christian faith. What says Luke of the Samaritans? *When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women*‡. What read we of Paul? What of Lydia? What of the centurion? What of the jailor and his household? They are all described as receiving baptism in consequence of their apparent godliness and avowed faith in the christian saviour. Nothing is to be found but the baptism of *professed* believers.

But to proceed, you have been asked—
 “ what use is baptism of to children? What
 “ benefits do they receive by it?” To this you
 reply, “ of what use is circumcision to *Ishmael*,
 “ to *Esau*, and to the jewish children; and
 “ what benefits did they receive? Yea of what
 “ benefit or use was baptism to multitudes bap-
 “ tized by *John* in *Jordan* and at *Enon*; or to
 “ *Simon Magus*, and to numbers of those who have
 “ renounced their infant baptism, and been dip-
 “ ped by *Dr. Gill* and others at adult years?”

F 4

The

* Acts ii. 38, 41. † Ibid. viii. 37. ‡ Ibid. viii. 12.

The answer, however, is at hand. From your own mouth have we received it. “ Notwithstanding, say you, many who are baptized are never the better for it; yet God will have a *visible church* in the world, and therefore, his visible seal is to be set on them *whom he prescribes.*” But are *infants*, then, prescribed? Or is there any command for the baptism of *children*? If not, you have been far from replying to the purpose.

You seem, however, to be much surprized that we should acknowledge that dying infants may inherit glory, and yet deny that they may receive benefit from baptism. If, say you, they inherit glory, they must have grace. True; but do they receive grace in consequence of their baptism?—Of an ordinance to which they can never be lawfully subjected? To *say* they do is very easy; but it is not so easy to *prove* it. Grace they certainly *may* receive, and it is to be hoped they *do receive it*:—but this, alas! cannot be owing to their baptism (a ceremony which the scripture hath no where appointed for them) but to the free and indiscriminating goodness of God,—that God, whose mercy and compassion is as boundless and as unrestrained as his power! But the reader perhaps will say, if you acknowledge that infants may have grace, why do you refuse to baptize them? To this I answer, that nothing can be more presumptuous than to set up the methods of divine grace with *dying* infants, as the rule of our conduct to the *living*;—I mean in matters of religious institution. Besides, who can look forwards into the distant regions of futurity, and say this infant shall reach the farthest stage of life, but that shall end its travels almost as soon as it hath begun

begun them? But if we are ignorant of this, we cannot say which infant will receive grace, and which will not; and, consequently, we can have no encouragement from this quarter to baptize any of them.—We are referred, however, in the next place, to an instance in which the subject of baptism had neither faith nor repentance, but was more incapable of receiving moral benefits by the ordinance than Dr. Gill can pretend infants are. “*Behold, says our author, all ye christian parents, for your comfort and establishment in this matter, this instance is no other than Jesus the great head of the church!*” Nay, so confident is he that his correspondent must submit at once to the force of his argument, that he cries out,—“you, doubtless, are convinced;” though the Doctor, it seems, is such an hardened and such an incorrigible bigot, that he will not yield, “*unless one comes from the dead!*” But fair and softly, irrefragable sir! Let us examine what you have said, and look boldly at this *apparition* of an argument before we frighten ourselves. Christ, you say, had neither faith nor repentance, and yet he was baptized. True; in this you have well said. But shall we presume, then, to compare the polluted and the guilty offspring of men to the spotless Son of God? Or shall we have the boldness to liken our infants to him who was the brightness of his father’s glory, and the express image of his person? Jesus, we know, had neither faith nor repentance: for he was holy, harmless, and undefiled, and therefore could have no occasion for either; whereas infants, even the infants of believers themselves, are all shapen in iniquity, and conceived in original guilt. The case, then, is widely different. But to sift your argument to the bottom, let us
 ask

ask you,—*when* was Jesus baptized? Not till *thirty years* of age. If, therefore, we are to make a precedent of his baptism in one circumstance, wherefore not in another? Again, if the baptism of Christ is a proof that *some* persons may be admitted to the ordinance without either faith or repentance, why not, that *all* may be so admitted,—*adult* persons as well as infants,—especially as our Lord himself, when baptized, was an adult. Besides, Jesus Christ was baptized by *John*; and you have already laughed at the Doctor for being so weak as to think that *John's* baptism was *christian* baptism*. Wherefore, then, have you thus appealed to it as a precedent? Verily, we may return the compliment, the respectful compliment, which you have passed upon your antagonist, and say that bigotry (that powerful but delusive enchantress) hath forced you *to say and unsay, just to serve your own turn!*

Thus we have examined the several texts which are produced as *express commands and warrants* for infant baptism. But, notwithstanding all his vaunting, our author himself appears to question the force of them;—for he has concluded what he hath said of them by referring us to the alteration of the sabbath from the seventh day to the first, and to the admission of women to the Lord's supper—for neither of which, in his opinion, we have a more express command than for infant baptism. But as to the former case, we are expressly told that the disciples assembled on the *first day* for the performance of the most solemn duties and acts of worship. See Acts xx. 7. and 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2:—and as to the

the admission of women, they are not only capable of every qualification which is required, but are particularly mentioned as fellow-worshippers with other disciples, see Acts i. 13, 14, 15. compared with chap. ii. 42, 44, 46. If our author can produce such evidence for infant-baptism, we shall readily excuse him from quoting precepts and express commands. But as he can do neither one nor the other, he hath betaken himself to his old haunt and his surest refuge. He hath required us to produce a precept for repealing an ordinance which was never actually instituted, and for excluding infants from a church of which they were never yet declared to be members, that is, the christian or gospel-church ! If we can do this, and prove Christ and his apostles to have been errant triflers---he hath promised to become a proselyte ! But even here we must be very cautious what we do, and treat him with the utmost tenderness, lest haply his known antipathy to the *disagreeable*, the *painful*, and the *dangerous* chill of cold water should get the better of his conscience. We must therefore wait for a *summer's day*,* or rather for one of the *dog-days*, when not a cloud is to be seen, nor a breath of wind to be felt,---when the air is sweltered with the sultry beams of *Phæbus*, and man and beast are panting with thirsty heat. Then, and not tell then, our *lady-like Theologue* must be conducted to the water, well-wrapped, we may suppose, and swaddled up in double flannels, like an *Egyptian* mummy, to secure his tender limbs. But who must perform the operation ?---the Doctor ? No, truly, this will never do ; for *he* belike

is

* Letters. Page 56. vid. the little note at the bottom.

is an ancient man. Age hath long ago unbraced his nerves, and deprived his body of its vigour. Rather, therefore, let us search the kingdom through, till we can find an able and a sturdy operator, who hath *brawny arms and Herculean strength** to plunge the shiverer in a trice. Nor let us forget, when the ceremony is over, to put him instantly into a warm bed, and ply him heartily with rich and reviving cordials:—otherwise, perhaps, the fright would carry him off!

But enough about *precepts*. Let us now proceed to *precedents*. The first which our author has mentioned is that of the *Israelites*! “Were not the *children of the Israelites*, says he, baptized as well as their parents, or was there another miracle wrought to prevent it?” No, verily, their *children* were baptized also; and, at this rate, so were their *sheep* and their *oxen*, and their very goods and baggage, which, doubtless, may furnish a hopeful argument for baptizing bells and candles. But supposing the case before us to be a precedent not only of the *mode* (as the Doctor would have it) but even of the *subjects* of baptism,—where is the danger? The *Israelites* are spoken of—how? Most certainly as a *collective* body, without any reference either to age or sex; and as such they are said to have been *types*,—types of the church of Christ. Accordingly, as all who were members of the *jewish* church were baptized unto their leader *Moses* in the cloud and the sea, so all who are members of the christian church must be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Who then, were members of the *jewish* church? Those,

Those, and those only, *whom God appointed to be so*. In the same manner, those, and those only, whom Christ hath appointed to be members of the *christian* church should as such be baptized in his name,---and, consequently, not infants. Such then, is our author's argument from the baptism of the *Israelites*. If the reader should think it a very strange one (as I do) let him not be surprized. For the man who can advance *one* strange thing, may as easily advance *another*. The man who can gravely tell us that *Nebuchadnezzar* was baptized, though a heathen and an idolatrous prince, and that a meer *tree*, a *stump*, was baptized likewise, and all this from the meaning of a word (*Βαπτισμα*) which is no where used to specify the ordinance of baptism,---what will he not tell us!

We are referred, in the next place, to the several households which were baptized by St. Paul. The *jailor's* is mentioned first. How then, shall we, or how *can* we prove that the jailor had no children? that is, no *young* children, no *infants*; for *adult* children are out of the question. Now here we can never sufficiently commend our author for the witty ingenuity with which he hath rallied us, and his inviolable regard to truth when he hath a mind to humble us. He hath informed us of an argument which I have never seen nor even heard of before; but nevertheless (if we may venture to believe him) an argument which hath been urged by one of our brethren. "It may very much be questioned (says this "wise and very discerning brother of our's, "but whether real or fictitious I cannot tell) "it may very much be questioned whether the "jailor had any children"---wherefore? verily, "because

“ because it hath been observed that for many
 “ years together not one child was born to all
 “ the jail-keepers in all the county of Essex.”

Now this, as our author tells us, is *demonstration*! Let us suppose then, that he hath related nothing but the truth, and that sooner than utter a falsehood to serve a turn, he would suffer the Doctor to *overwhelm* him again and again ;---let us suppose that his veracity is not the dupe of his zeal, and that lying is the very sin which he most abominates ;---let us farther suppose that he can produce the name of this *extraordinary brother*, and tell us *when* and *where* he first published his truly wonderful argument,---we must then, alas! acknowledge that there is a fool or two among the *Antipædo-baptists* as well as among their neighbours! What a woeful disaster! But does *Candidus*, then imagine that because *some* of us may have the misfortune to be errant block-heads, it will therefore follow that we are *all* so? Or if one here and there hath used a simple, a foolish argument, will he from thence infer that none of us can produce a *good* one? Must we all, and the Doctor among the rest of us, claim affinity to the sons of *Gotham*, and be despised as meer ideots and moon-rakers? Forgive me funny Sir, if upon this occasion (for it is sometimes allowable to compare great things to small)---forgive me if I presume to liken you to the honest taylor in the story. Alas! poor Buckram! though nature had never designed him for a cudgel-player, yet fraught with noble rage and determined to approve himself a real hero, he frowned upon the first tree he came to, and assailing it right gallantly with his oaken staff,---“ there, cries
 “ he

“ he, good Mr. *Ass* if thou wert but a man
 “ as thou art a tree, how finely could I maul
 “ thee”! In like manner, if this pretty argument from the *Essex* jail-keepers was but the Doctor’s, and not a silly brother’s,---what sweet work you would have made with him! You would have smitten him, you would have cut him, you would have gashed him here and there and every where!

But, after all, what is the matter with the Doctor’s argument, that you should make such a fool of him? For, in your opinion, he reasons worse, much worse, than our simple conjurer of a brother. The Doctor hath told you that there were *no children*, that is, *no infants* in the jailor’s family,—why? Because it is said that he believed in God *with all his house*; “ and he, as the Doctor adds, who can find “ any other in the house than all who were “ in it (that is, than all who believed) must be reckoned a very sagacious person.” Indeed I think so too. But you it seems are highly satisfied with telling us that the word *all* is frequently used in a *limited* sense. Consequently, when the historian says, that *all* the house believed, he only means that *some* of them believed. Now suppose we should be willing to talk with you in your own way, and to take the word *all* in the very sense you would have us,—will this please you? If it will, what shall we think, or what shall we say, when we read that *all* the family were baptized? We must say, truly, that only *some* of them were baptized. But if *some* of them were baptized, and *some* of them were not baptized,—in which party are his *supposed children* to be included? Verily, with all your cunning and sagacity, you have forgotten the Doctor’s axiom, his darling
 axiom,

axiom, "that *whatever proves too much, proves nothing*"!—As to your doubt—"that every individual in the same family should have *new hearts, penitent spirits, and saving faith* in the *same nick of time*,"—where was your piety, your religion, your reverence for the sacred oracles, that you should sneer at that as an idle tale, which you ought to admire and glory in as an astonishing instance of the energy of divine grace? What! is the arm of the Almighty shortened that he cannot save? Or is ~~is~~ not he who can change the hearts of many hundreds and many thousands of individuals, equally able to convert a single family? The only excuse we can make for you (and God forbid we should refuse to excuse a brother, though his offences should be even *seventy times seven*) the only excuse we can make for you, is, that your zeal hath gotten the better of your understanding; and that bigotry, in the hurry of dispute, hath constrained you to say what you never would have said in the cooler moments of reflection!

But let us hasten to the household of *Lydia*. Who, then was *Lydia*? If we may take Mr. *Mayo's* word for it, she was a *mother*. But was she likewise a *wife*? Or was she a *widow*? If neither, let the reader judge what a pretty compliment our author hath passed upon her! Aye, but who can tell what good intelligence he hath met with? It may be, he hath dispatched a messenger either to *Philippi* or *Thyatira* to search the registers:—and yet methinks, after all, it is somewhat strange, if she had a husband, that herself should be chief manager of the business, and chief ruler of the household.

For

For whatever may be the custom in good old *England*, I cannot persuade myself that in *Lydia's* country (the eastern part of the world) it was the usual privilege of the ladies to wear the breeches; nor, indeed, to carry on business at a distance from their husbands. On the other hand, if she was a *widow*, it is somewhat surprising that she is not mentioned as such, as well as other pious women. Besides, even supposing her to have been a widow, we may still enquire how long her husband had been dead? If *several years*, her children were not *infants*: but if our author should say *only a month or two*, or something like it, how can he prove the assertion?—But married or unmarried, a mother or no mother, there is not a word, it seems, in scripture which intimates that her household believed, or so much as attended to the words of the apostles. The Doctor, however, has been simple enough to think otherwise. Wherefore? “Because, truly, those in *Lydia's* house were *brethren*, whom afterwards the apostles went to see, and whom they comforted, and so not infants.” But he hath not referred, says Mr. *Mayo*, to the *text* for this; and to be sure, we shall not be weak enough to take his word for it. What, then, says the evangelist? *And they* (that, is the apostles) *went out of prison, and entered into the house of Lydia; and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them and departed.* Acts xvi. 40. Now this should intimate, one would think, that the brethren they saw and comforted were of *Lydia's* family. No, verily, says our author, this can never be supposed; for what a wonder of wonders would it be, that there should be several brethren grown up to men, living in one house, and a sister be

the master of the household! True, Sir, a *she-master* in this case would have been very unseemly. But does the Doctor, then, mean that they were *Lydia's natural brethren*? He hath not told us that he does. But *Mayo*, alas! is determined to be *Mayo* still, and to dress the Doctor (according to custom) in a party-coloured vest, and put the cap of folly on his head, that he may afterwards laugh at him and banter him at his leisure. For my part, however, it appears to me that, by the *brethren*, the Doctor means only her *religious domestics*; whom the evangelist might very innocently speak of as brethren, in a *spiritual* sense, without the least affront to their mistress, or, if Mr. Mayo will have it so, their *master*. It is true, indeed, that we read nothing of their believing in express terms: but if the very apostles themselves could look upon them as *christian brethren*, they may be supposed, as christian brethren, to have professed the same faith as the apostles. Our author, indeed would persuade us that the brethren in question were the *christian believers of the city*. Who, then, were these? The only persons whom *Paul* converted and baptized in the city of *Philippi* (at least so far as the history informs us) were *Lydia* and the jailor and their respective households. What, then, can be more likely than that the brethren whom the apostles saw and comforted, when they left the prison, were neither more nor less than the believing household of the former?

As to the household of *Stephanas*, the Doctor told us, (and produceth his authority for saying so) that they *addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints*,—from whence he supposes that they were not infants or young children. In
what

what manner hath our author answered him? By telling us that his reasoning is *futile and beneath a school-boy!* A short answer this, and doubtless a very sufficient one from a gentleman of Mr. Mayo's infallible discernment! It is to be hoped, however, that he will suffer us to reason in our own way, all futile and all childish as it is, till he can spare time to instruct our ignorance and put us in a better.

Thus, Sir, we have considered your argument from the several households which were baptized by St. Paul. But why should we call it an argument? you have referred us to the scripture-households to prove the truth of infant-baptism. But wherein lies the proof? You *suppose* (and what may we not suppose, if we have a mind to it!) you *suppose* that there was an infant or two in each of the households in question. Can you prove, then, that this was the case? Hath every family a child in it? Or supposing it hath, is every child an infant? If not, how can you tell that there was an infant in the household of *Lydia*? Or an infant in the household of the *jailer*? Or an infant in the household of *Stephanas*? Or in all or any one of the households you have mentioned? Truly by putting *us* to prove that there were *no children* in either of them. A very ingenious *come off!* and yet we have freely given our reasons for espousing the *negative*. You ought, however, if you are able to do it, to have given us a proof, not that a *household* hath been baptized, but that the household referred to had an *infant* in it, one at the least; otherwise you give us *a proof and no proof*.

But, after all, even supposing we should own what you want us to own, that we are absolute-

ly uncertain whether or not the households in question had any infants,—even here the consequence will not be unfavourable. But before I tell you what the consequence is, let us know your mind. You have intimated that you believe, or fain would believe, that the scripture households had each of them an infant. But are you *certain* of this? If you are, you would have told us so in plain terms; you would have boasted of it, and repeated it again and again; in short, we should never have heard the last of it. Let us suppose, then, that we are *both* under the same uncertainty, and that neither you nor your opponents can prove any thing either *pro* or *con*. Now, what will be the consequence? It is manifestly this—that if we are both of us alike uncertain, whether the scripture-households had any infants or not, it must also be a great uncertainty whether or not there are any precedents of infant-baptism. But what shall we say of a *dubious, uncertain precedent*? We must say that it is *no precedent at all*. For when we refer to precedents to direct our practice in a doubtful point of duty, it always *is*, and *must* be supposed, that such precedents are incontestable; otherwise we shall employ one uncertainty to remove another. But, in fact, the case before us is not so full of darkness and uncertainty as you would willingly persuade us: for the scripture-character of the several households you have mentioned, is not applicable to *infants*. The jailor's household were *believers*, Lydia's were christian *brethren*, and Stephanas' are said to have addicted themselves to the *ministry of the saints*.

If it were needful to say any thing more about precedents, we might refer you to Acts viii, 12,

when many of the Samaritans believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, what did he do with them? They were baptized both men and women. Now if it was the practice of the apostles to administer baptism to covenant-infants, how natural would it have been to have said, “ they were baptized, men, women, and “ *children.*” For if the historian is so very particular as to notice the *sex*, he would, doubtless, have been equally explicit as to the difference of *Age*, if there had been any room for it.

As to your observation, that if children received *natural* benefit from Christ, on account of the *faith* of their parents,—we may, with equal reason, suppose that they *did, may, and do* receive, at times, *spiritual* benefit and blessings on the same account;—here I heartily join with you, and am persuaded the Doctor will do so too,—else wherefore do we pray for them? But *when,—when*, I say, do they receive these spiritual benefits? You must answer, when they are old enough to make use of their reason. At least till then, neither you, nor I, nor the Doctor can affirm any thing either *pro* or *con.*—You have farther reminded us that children *have* suffered and *do* suffer for the disobedience of their first parents; and that many instances may be produced from history, of childrens suffering through, and being involved in the guilt and punishment of their parents *evil deeds*. Wherefore, then, should I, or Doctor Gill, or doctor anybody, deny them to be equally benefited by their righteous parents *righteous* deeds? Wherefore, indeed! For temporal benefits are frequently bestowed on the children, as an open reward to the believing and the faithful parent: and christians have sometimes the satisfaction,

though not always, to behold their offspring partakers of the like precious faith with themselves. But, after all, let them wait till they discover their children to be what they wish them to be,—true penitents, and true believers. It will then be time enough to think of admitting them to baptism. It is our duty, indeed, to pray for them and instruct them;—to recommend them to the divine favour night and day, and teach them the principles of that faith which was once delivered to the saints: but let us wait till we see the effect of our prayers, and the good fruits of our pious instructions, before we receive them, by the water of baptism, into the congregation of the faithful. Otherwise, let us admit them in good earnest, and receive them to one ordinance as well as to the other; to the holy table as well as to the font,—and allow them the same privileges under the *christian* as under the legal dispensation. But, now-a-days, the gospel-ordinances are strangely separated, and many hundreds who have received baptism are never admitted to the supper, not only during their infancy, but even afterwards when they come to years of full discretion. Such, then, is the church-membership of infants! A church-membership which it is almost sacrilege to deprive them of. They are declared christians without the privilege of christian communion, and are received into the congregation of the faithful without belonging to it. In short, they are both *in* the church and *out* of the church, and yet neither *out* of the church nor *in* it! Verily, good reader, if the monster *Sphinx*, who devoured those that could not answer her riddles, had proposed such a riddle as this to the hero

Oedipus,

Oedipus, she must certainly have made a meal of him.

But our author hath required, and openly defied us, to produce one scripture-precedent for delaying the baptism of the children of christian parents till grown up; or for baptizing adult persons who were born of such parents. His meaning is plainly this. “ The compass of the “ New Testament history is at least *sixty years* “ after Christ; but in all this *length of time* and “ *course of years*, there is not a single instance “ upon record of the baptism of an adult person whose parents were christians.—What “ then?—Why, truly, it will follow, either that “ none of the christians, for sixty years together, had believing children (which would be “ as improbable as it is untrue) or, on the “ other hand, that these children were all baptized at the same time as their parents, or at “ least in their infancy, in consequence of their “ parents faith.” But, come, as no man can tell his strength till he tries it, who knows but we may get the better even of *this argument*, all formidable as it is? What, then, shall we say to it? Why, suppose we say, as we may, that the only part of the New Testament-history, after the death of Christ, in which, instances of the case required could ~~only~~, if any where, be expected, is the *Acts of the Apostles*; for surely the book of the *Revelation* could never be thought of for such a purpose. (O Mayo, Mayo, thou never hadst thy diploma of M. A. for thy skill in chronology, whatever others may have had; for the *Acts of the Apostles* contains a history only of about *thirty years*;) and suppose we say that the said history was not written to describe the *growth and progress*, but only the founding,

and, as it were, the *birth* of particular churches. Verily, upon this supposition, it would be as unreasonable to expect an account who were baptized (that is, after the founding or first establishment of a church) as who and who were admitted to the supper.—Again, to follow our author's way of arguing, is it not surprizing, if it was the custom of the apostles to baptize infants, that for *a length of time, a course of years*, even *sixty* years, there is not one instance, one plain and express instance of this nature in the whole history. Indeed it is very surprizing! So surprizing, that it will be very difficult to account for it.

Thus far, then, we have escaped tolerably well; and, to make the least of it, come off as handsomely as our antagonist. Now, then for the victory.

Can we say, can we prove that, in a single instance, the *householder* was baptized at one time, and the *household* at another? Good reader, attend to what we say, and then judge for yourself. The first person that we shall mention is *Crispus*, the chief ruler of a synagogue. By whom, then, was *he* baptized? We read by the apostle *Paul*. “*I baptized none of you*, says he, “*but Crispus and Gaius, &c.*”—That is, none of you *Corinthians*: which plainly intimates that he baptized the *household* of neither. But had *Crispus* a *household*? We read, in Acts xviii, 8, that he had not only a *household*, but a *believing* household. Wherefore, then, were not his household baptized? Undoubtedly they were baptized; but not by the apostle *Paul*. From whence it is probable, that though they *did believe*, and were baptized, it was some days, and, it may be several weeks, or several months, *af-*
ter

ter Crispus himself was baptized. Here, then, is one precedent,—a precedent for delaying the baptism of the children of christian parents till believers. The case of *Gaius* would, in all likelihood, furnish another. But this we shall omit, and pass to *Stephanas*. Who, then, baptized *Stephanas*? Not *Paul*; for he only baptized his household. If, therefore, *Stephanas* himself was ever baptized, as it is plain he must have been, (see 1 Cor. xvi, 17,) he was baptized at some other time, and by some other person, before the apostle baptized his household. Here, then, is a third precedent. So that your *desiances*, your boasting *desiances*, are no longer in full force. You will reply, perhaps, by running off to that ever hospitable trope, and friendly asylum of baffled disputants, the *Synechdoche*: the *household* includes the household and the master; and the *master* includes the master and the household. But if this was the apostles meaning, instead of mentioning the master in one instance, and the household in another, it is highly probable that he would have mentioned the master in all of them; and said, “ I baptized none of you but “ *Crispus*, and *Gaius*, and *STEPHANAS*.” You must, therefore, bid adieu to tropes and figures, and never hope by these, in the present instance, to combat adversaries whom you have handled with such unsparing severity.

Your last resort is to *antiquity*. But as the Doctor hath not pleaded this in his favour in his printed sermon, you have wisely concluded that *he is at length convinced 'tis against him*: though, it should seem by what you have said in the next page, he still retains a fondness for *Tertullian*, and hath even *gloried* in him a little too freely. Considering, however, the strength
and

and long continuance of his former prejudices, this may be deemed somewhat excusable,---he could not wean himself all at once. But oh! fatal, fatal blunder, the Doctor hath declared that infant-baptism is a *popish invention and foolery*. Now what does this manifest? "It shews," says our author, (something or another, we may well suppose, which is too bad to be mentioned)---"it shews---but I spare him." Well done, Mr. Orator! what a beautiful *Aposiopesis*! Verily, thou hast learned *rhétoric* for something? But whatever may be the meaning of this dumb eloquence, this speaking silence,---we need not hesitate to pronounce the Doctor an *ignoramus*, a *meer ignoramus in chronology and ecclesiastical history*! For who knows not that the *first pope* was *Boniface* the third, in the seventh century, anno 606? If any one whoever should be so ignorant as *not* to know it, let him only read the note at the bottom of the page, in which our chronologer and historian of lasting note hath kindly noted (as a note, to be sure of his own great learning and extensive reading) "that the title *papa* or *pope* " was not peculiar to the bishops of *Rome*, " but was given to *all* bishops in the *first* " centuries of the church. We frequently meet " with *papa* or *pope* Cyprian, &c." Now this is argument! this is proof! this is demonstration! many bishops before *Boniface* were called *papæ* or *popes*---ergo, *papa* or *pope* *Boniface* was not only the first *universal bishop*, but the *first pope* or *papa* among them all! But, O thou, the very *Zeno* of modern divines, and the trusty sword of Pædo-baptism; is there no difference between the baptism of infants as a new, an unsettled, and a confined practice, and as a general

neral and an established custom ? And is there no difference between the beginning of popery, and its being at its height, or near it, as in the time of *Boniface* ? If there is, the Doctor might safely speak of it as a *popish foolery*, &c. without denying that it prevailed here and there before the *papacy* was at its height. Accordingly, he hath frankly told us, that it was moved for in *Tertullian's* time, and practised in the days of *Cyprian* (see the argument from apostolic tradition, &c. page 18th.)

But let us hear what you are able to urge from *antiquity*. We will suppose, then, that you are not beholden in this point (as it should seem the Doctor is) to *the references of an opponent*, but to your own *learning and reading*; we will suppose that you have read the fathers over and over with your own eyes, and that you have set up night after night, yea whole nights together for that purpose, we will suppose that there is scarcely a volume, — a scrap of primitive theology which you have not seen, and thoroughly examined, and searched as carefully as lawyers peruse the statute-book. Come then, Mr. *Industry*, let us see what you have been able to glean from the fields of antiquity. You begin with the *fourth* century, from whence you proceed to the *third*, and afterwards to the *second*. Infant-baptism, truly, prevailed not only in the fourth century, but also in the third; not only in the third, but also in the second; and if in the second century, consequently in the *first*; what a beautiful gradation!

Let us begin, then, with the *fourth* century, in which *Austin* (it seems) maintained
that

that the christian church had always held and practised infant baptism as an apostolic *tradition*. Now we may doubtless suppose from hence that the word of *St. Austin* is genuine gospel, and ought never to be called in question upon any account. For if we may dispute it in one case, we certainly may in another. Be it so, then ; — *St. Austin* was infallible. Will this please you? If it will, — who is it that declares *infant-communion*, to be

an a sacred, a apostolic tradition ?---*St. Austin*---Who is it that mentions exorcisms and exufflations as rites in baptism of ancient tradition, and therefore used by the christian church *throughout the world* ?---*St. Austin*.---Who is it that speaks of consecrating the waters of baptism, and anointing the subjects of it with oil ? —*St. Austin*—Who is it that describes *immersion* (that *disagreeable*, that *painful*, that dangerous practice) as the received mode in which the ordinance was administered ?—*St. Austin*,—the very same *St. Austin* who is referred to as the great bulwark of infant-baptism. Aye, but his cotemporary *Pelagius* was a *Pædo-baptist*, though it would have been his interest to have *objected* to the baptism of infants as not practised by the apostles. But wherefore his interest ? Truly, because he denied original sin. But have none of the Baptists denied it ? Yes, verily ; —and yet I have not heard of one of them who hath argued from the denial of baptism to infants ; which, however, might as reasonably be expected of *them*, as of *Pelagius*. But *Pelagius* declares, says our author, not only that he himself was for infant-baptism, but that he never heard, no not of an *impious heretic*, who would dispute it. Now, here, I will not ob-

ject

ject that none of the writings of *Pelagius* are extant,—nor that the words in question are a meer quotation, a quotation made by his antagonist; *St. Austin* I will suppose hath done him the strictest justice; so that we may now converse with *Pelagius*, and know his mind as fully and as surely, as if he had spoken to us by word of mouth. But, after all, I am far from being satisfied, that even in this case, what he says was meant of infant-baptism. What! had he never heard of *Tertullian*,---neither he, nor *St. Austin*? Or hath our spiritual antiquary never read in *Jerome* of some christians, at the very time we are speaking of (the age of *Pelagius*) who refused to give baptism to their children? Hath he read nothing to the same purpose in his favourite *Augustin*? Or hath he never seen the canon,---“it is likewise our pleasure that whoever denies that new-born infants are to be baptized, let him be anathema,”---a canon of the council of *Carthage* in which *Austin* was president, and which manifestly supposes that infant-baptism was by some denied and rejected? Lastly, hath he never read, hath he never heard, that the *Pelagians* themselves denied baptism to the infants of believers? If he hath not, his opponents have. Accordingly, it is sufficiently plain from the connection, that *Pelagius* refers not to infant-baptism, but to the charge which was alledged against him, that he had promised the kingdom of heaven to some, that is to infants, without the redemption of Christ,---a charge which his enemies grounded on his denial of the doctrine of original sin.

---But after all, says our author, “it is very remarkable, that in the list of what are stiled
“ *heretics*

“ *heretics and heresies*, from the apostles time
 “ to the eleventh century, we meet with none
 “ that deny infant-baptism.” But what does this
 prove? If we are certain, as we are and must
 be, that *Tertullian* and others disapproved of
 it, it will follow either that these were no
 heretics, or that the persons who compiled the
 list were a very negligent and a very careless
 set of men, and consequently not to be re-
 garded.

But it is time to go back to the *third* cen-
 tury. As to *Cyprian*, then, and his boasted
 council of *sixty-six bishops*, the very arguments
 they produce for infant-baptism are sufficient
 arguments that it was a *novel*, an *infant-practise*,
 for how have they argued? Do they refer us
 to any precept for it in the holy scriptures?---
No.---Do they refer us to the custom of the apo-
 stles, or their immediate successors?---*No.*---
 What then do they do? They offer arguments
 which any modern *Pædo-baptists* would be
 ashamed of ;---such as the giving the grace of
 God to all men, and the equality of the gift to
 all, as proved from the spiritual equality of the
 bodies of infants and adults, which is inferred
 from *Elisha's* stretching himself on the child of
 the *Shunamite*. They farther argue from the
 words of *Peter* that nothing is to be called *com-*
mon or unclean, and from the comparative inno-
 cence of infants, and the necessity of baptism to
 salvation. Yea, the weeping and the crying of
 infants they have interpreted as praying. What
 hopeful arguments are these! Yet such were the
 arguments of *Cyprian* and his council of bishops.
 (See his letter to *Fidus*.) If therefore, even those
 who lived in the *third* century, when arguing
 professedly for the baptism of infants, have not
 pleaded

pleaded antiquity, what shall we say of the modern *Pædo-baptists* who make this their last resort, their strong, their impregnable fortress? But, come, let us allow that father *Cyprian*, and his brethren bishops, are to rule our practice, and guide our faith;---they shall govern, and we submit; they shall be masters, and we the scholars. What then, says *Cyprian*? He plainly intimates that, in his time, *infant-communion* was the received practice of the church; for he relates to that purpose an extraordinary story of which himself was an eye-witness. Again, in *Cyprian's* age, the sign of the cross, exorcism, the consecration or sanctifying of the water of baptism, holy chrisms, the baptismal ring and kiss, and several other ceremonies were in use which are now rejected. But if the authority of *Cyprian* is of any weight, let us revive these ancient usages;—otherwise let us no longer plead it for infant-baptism.

As to *Origen*, as our author hath only mentioned his name, without telling us what he says, it will be needless to take any notice of him. As to *Irenæus*, moreover, who lived in the *second* century, and *Clemens Romanus* who lived in the *first*,—I am not surprized our author hath told us that these also were likeminded (that is *Pædobaptists*) without quoting any thing from either of them: for, in truth, as to infant-baptism they are totally silent,—yea they have not so much as hinted it, no not once.—But what shall I say, when I hear *Justin* mentioned?—an author who wrote openly and avowedly in defence of the christian religion? What! is *Candidus* ignorant, with all his boasting, and all his pretended skill in ecclesiastical history, is he ignorant, that the primitive christians in the
days

days of *Justin* were shamefully slandered, and traduced as using their children, their own children with the vilest inhumanity? Was this a trifling charge, a trifling accusation? If not,—when he gives the Emperor an open, a fair, a particular account of christian baptism, wherefore did he omit and overlook the baptism of infants? Why did he not plead, and insist upon it, by way of defence (and a very natural defence it would have been) that the christians were so far from misusing their children, that, on the contrary, they openly blessed them, and devoted them to the Almighty, by one of the most solemn ordinances of their religion? If infant-baptism is to be looked for any where, it should be *here*; if it was the practice of *Justin* and his cotemporaries, we should find it *here*. But, so far from this, he hath not mentioned it:—on the contrary, the very account he hath given us of christian baptism excludes the baptism of infants. See the whole at length in Rees, page 160, of *Infant-baptism no Institution*, &c.

But to proceed, let us suppose that the first of the fathers who hath mentioned infant-baptism had heartily approved of it, and recommended it;—that he had supported it by nervous arguments, and solid proofs;—then, alas! with what triumph and assurance would his testimony have been produced against us!—and what a load of rebuke would have been cast upon us for standing out against such powerful evidence! we should have been condemned as manifest bigots,—stubborn, unyielding, incorrigible bigots. But, on the other hand, because *Tertulian*, the first of the fathers who hath taken notice of it, hath spoken *against* it, the case is altered.

altered. What in *us* would have been obstinacy, is only wariness and circumspection in our *opponents*. *Tertullian*, truly, hath not *denied* infant-baptism, but “*fully proves* it was “ the practice of the church in his time.” Verily, this is strange indeed! He hath disapproved of it, he hath opposed it, he hath wrote and argued against it, and yet he hath not *denied* it. At this rate, neither the Doctor, nor I, nor any other person hath denied it. But how hath he proved, fully proved; that it was the general practice of the church in his own times? Truly, by standing forth against it. Consequently, if Mr *Mayo*, should set pen to paper, and go to work with those he nicknames the *pure Glassites*, his performance, if it should survive the havock of time, and live to distant centuries, would then be a proof, a full proof, that the principles he opposes would be the prevailing principles of the age. Aye, but *Tertullian*’s Motive for opposing infant-baptism was a notion that baptism washed away sin. This, at least, is what our author would insinuate. But hath he ever read *Tertullian*? If he hath, he must *think* otherwise, whatever he is pleased to *say*. For *Tertullian*’s reason (if his own words may determine it) is the incapacity of infants to understand the *meaning* of baptism. “ Our Lord says indeed”, (these are his words)—“ our Lord says indeed, “ forbid them not (that is, infants) to come unto “ me: let them come, then, when they are “ grown up; let them come when they under- “ stand; let them be made christians, when “ they can know Christ, &c.” How, then, could you so artfully insinuate that the necessity of baptism to regenerate and wash away sin, first led some to object against the baptism of infants?

are

fants ? Is this the objection of any modern *Anti-pædobaptist* ? Far from it. The notion, indeed, both *was* and *still is* adopted by the *Romish* church ; and is, in fact, the strongest pillar of infant-baptism, not only among *catholics*, but in the minds of many ignorant protestants ; and so firmly is it fixed, that if every argument which the *Baptists* have urged should be deemed unanswerable, this alone would support a practice with some persons which custom and education have rendered venerable.

To conclude, if it is a matter of such convincing, such powerful, such incontestible, such irresistible evidence as Mr. *Mayo* would willingly persuade us, that it was the general, and the constant custom, of the primitive churches, to administer baptism to infants, how happens it, that several eminent and very learned Pædobaptists have considered the practice as a thing of doubtful original, and questioned the frequency, and indeed the very existence of it in the earlier ages of christianity* ? These are circumstances of *undeniable* truth, and, one would think, of force sufficient to abate the confidence of every boasting zealot, and stagger the prejudices of every modest and dispassionate reasoner.

Thus, good reader, we have fully considered what hath been advanced by Mr. *Mayo*, for the baptism of infants. Your business is to judge for yourself ;—and to judge, neither *negligently*, nor *hastily*. Not *hastily*, lest you mistake the mere *appearance* of truth for truth itself :—nor *negligently*, lest you put a slight upon a sacred ordinance, which Christ himself hath condescended to institute. Truth, in all cases, is an object worthy of attention,—but more especially in matters of religion. I know, indeed, that to
many

* See the Appendix,

many persons things of this nature, appear so trifling and immaterial that they will scarcely furnish room for *amusement*,—much less for *sober thought*. But, nevertheless, what heaven has thought proper to appoint, should claim the respect and attract the attention of every sensible man. Baptism is a *divine institution*:—we all acknowledge it to be so:—it is, therefore, certainly worth our while to have proper notions of it:—otherwise, the Almighty hath appointed an ordinance which is beneath our notice, and sent his Son to encumber us with a ceremony of the most trifling consequence. But if there is no one who would harbour a thought, which is so dishonourable to his maker, let us consider the subject with that sobriety and attention which is due to every thing that bears the signature of heaven. Let us no longer submit to the lessons of education, and the dictates of mere custom, (those masters which have too frequently misled the wise and the worthy, as well as the ignorant) but henceforward take our opinion of a sacred institution (such as baptism is) from those oracles which are the only standard of every religious appointment.

F I N I S.

Laus Deo optimo maximo.

APPENDIX.

A P P E N D I X.

*Testimonies in favour of believers baptism;
by learned Pædobaptists.*

G R O T I U S.

“ **I**NFANT baptism seems to me to have been
“ practised of old far more frequently in
“ *Africa* than in *Asia*, or any other parts of the
“ world, and with a greater opinion of its ne-
“ cessity. For in the councils we find no men-
“ tion of this custom before the council of
“ Carthage.”

Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

C U R C E L L Æ U S.

“ Pædobaptism, in the two first centu-
“ ries after Christ, was unknown, but in the
“ third and fourth was approved of by a few,
“ began to prevail in the fifth and subsequent
“ ages; and therefore this rite is observed by
“ us, not as an apostolic tradition, but as a
“ custom of long continuance.”

Relig. Christ. Inst. Lib. I. c. 12.

S U I C E R U S.

“ In the two first ages no one received baptism
“ unless he who being previously instructed in
“ the faith, and tingured with the doctrine of
“ Christ, could testify that he believed &c.”

Thesaur. Eccl. sub voce Συναξις.

B R A N D T.

“ That good and very ancient custom of baptizing infants, is advanced with too much violence by some, and opposed with no less by others. This ceremony, as some think, prevailed first in *Africa* and *Greece*, but in such a manner that some doctors of the church openly declared that they could not consent to it.”

Annot. on B. II. p. 8.

Bp. B A R L O W.

“ The truth is, infant baptism did (how or by whom I know not) come in in the second century,—and in the third and fourth began to be practised, though not generally, and defended as lawful by that text grossly misunderstood. John, iii. 5.”

Grantham's friendly epist. p. 11.

W H I S T O N.

After telling us that he had discovered that the only infants or little children intended by the early fathers when they speak of them as baptized, were those that were capable of catechetical instruction adds,—“ This most important discovery I soon communicated to the world in this paper (i. e. *Primitive infant-baptism revived*) which both bishop *Hoadly* and Dr. *Clark* greatly approved, but still went on in the ordinary practice, notwithstanding. I sent this paper also by an intimate friend, Mr. *Haines*, to Sir ISAAC NEWTON, and desired to know his opinion. The answer returned

“ was

“ was this, that they both had discovered the
“ same thing before ; nay, I afterwards found
“ that Sir *Isaac Newton* was so hearty for the
“ *Baptists* as well as for the Eusebians or Arians,
“ that he sometimes suspected these two were
“ the two witnesses in the Revelation.”

Vide Whiston's life page 177, 178.

Dr. *WHITBY*.

Owens that Dr. *Gale*'s very learned letters prove it to be doubtful and uncertain, whether infant-baptism did constantly obtain till several hundred years after Christ.

Differt. de S. Script. interpretatione, pref. § 5.

LUDOVICUS VIVES.

“ None were baptized of old, but those who
“ were of age, who did not only understand
“ what the mystery of the water meant, but de-
“ sired the same ; the perfect image whereof we
“ have yet in our infant-baptism. For it is asked
“ of the infant, wilt thou be baptized ? for
“ whom the sureties answer, I will.”

Comment. in August. lib. I. cap. 27.

Bp. *TAYLOR*.

Lib. Proph. p. 239. “ It is against the per-
“ petual analogy of Christ's doctrine to bap-
“ tize infants ; for besides that Christ never gave
“ any precept to baptize them, nor ever him-
“ self, nor his apostles, that appears, did baptize
“ any of them,—all that either he or his apostles
“ said concerning it, requires such previous dis-
“ positions to baptism, of which infants are not
“ capable, and these are faith and repentance.”

To make no more quotations on this head, many learned *Pædobaptists* have acknowledged that there is nothing *express*, either as to *precept* or *precedent*, for the baptism of infants, in the whole New Testament. They will farther acknowledge that the scriptures should be our only guide in matters of religious institution. The unprejudiced reader will draw the proper inference.

Testimonies in Favour of Immersion.

G R O T I U S.

“ That this rite (baptism) was wont to be per-
 “ formed by immersion, and not by perfusion,
 “ appears both from the propriety of the word,
 “ and the places chosen for its administration,
 “ John iii. 2, 3. Acts viii. 38, and from the
 “ many allusions of the apostle which cannot be
 “ be referred to sprinkling, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col.
 “ ii. 12.” Annot. in Mat. iii. 6.

M A S T R I C H T. S.S.T.P.

“ *Immersion only* was used by the apostles and
 “ primitive church.” Theologia, p. 918.

C A L V I N.

“ Here we plainly see what manner of bap-
 “ tizing there was among the ancients, for *the*
 “ *whole body was dipped into water.*”

On Acts viii. 38.

Bp. TAY-

Bp. TAYLOR.

“ The custom of the ancient church was not
“ sprinkling, but immersion, &c.”

Duct. Dub. lib. 3, 4.

Dr. WITSIUS.

(1.) “ It is certain that both John and the
“ disciples of Christ, ordinarily used dipping,
“ whose example was followed by the ancient
“ church. (2.) It cannot be denied that the na-
“ tive signification of the words βαπτειν and βαπτίζειν,
“ is to *plunge or dip*.—Nor are we to conceal
“ (3.) that there is a greater copiousness of sig-
“ nification, and a fuller similitude between the
“ sign and the thing signified in *immersion*. (4.)
“ Nay, that *immersion* may be performed in
“ cold countries, without any great danger of
“ health and life, appears from the example of
“ the *Russians*, who plunge the children that
“ are to be baptized three times all over, not
“ believing that baptism can be duly performed
“ by any other way.”

Œconomy of the Covenants, Vol. III. p. 1213, 1214.

Bp. TILLOTSON.

“ Anciently those who were baptized put off
“ their garments, which signified the putting off
“ the body of sin, and were immersed and bu-
“ ried in the water, &c.”

Sermon on 2 Tim. ii. 19. p. 82.

Bp. HOADLY.

Bp. HOADLY.

“ Baptism, or the ceremony of *immersion in*
 “ *water*, represents to christians their death un-
 “ to sin,” &c.

Sermon before the King, Feb. 15, 1729-30.

M E D E.

“ There was no such thing as sprinkling or
 “ *εὐλισμος* used in the apostles time, nor many
 “ ages after them.” Diatribe on Tit. iii. 5. p. 63.

Dr. MANTON,

“ The ancient manner of baptizing was to
 “ *dip* the parties baptized, and as it were bury
 “ them under the water for a while.”

On Rom. vi. 4. p. 14.

CALVIN.

“ The very word baptizing signifies to *dip*;
 “ and it is certain that the rite of *dipping* was
 “ observed of the ancient church,”

Inst. lib. 4. chap. 15. sect. 19.

LUTHER.

“ I would have those that are to be baptized,
 “ to be wholly dipped into the water, as the
 “ word imports, and the mystery doth signify.”

Tcm. II. de Baptism. Fol. 19.

Dr. HAM-

Dr. HAMMOND.

“ *Bαπτισμος* signifies an immersion, or washing
“ of the whole body. Annot. on John xiii. 10.

P O O L.

“ To be baptized is to be *dipped in water*.”
Vid. in Mat. xx. 22.

P I S C A T O R.

“ It seems to respect the ancient rite, when
“ as the whole body was dipt into the water,
“ and so as it were buried, and presently again
“ drawn out as out of the grave.”
In Rom. vi. 4. and Col. ii. 12.

Dr. D O D D R I D G E.

“ It seems the part of candor to confess, that
“ here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing
“ by *immersion*, as most usual in those early times.”
On Rom. vi. 4.

Dr. Tho. G O O D W I N.

“ The eminent thing signified and represented
“ in baptism is not simply the blood of Christ,
“ as it washeth us from sin, but there is a fur-
“ ther representation therein of Christ’s death,
“ burial, and resurrection; in the baptized be-
“ ing first buried under water, and then rising
“ out of it.” &c.

Christ set forth, edit. 2d, p. 128.

I might

I might quote many more Pædobaptists to the same purpose, but shall conclude with what the learned and favourite Dr. Owen hath said of the Jewish baptisms. “The Rabbins, said he, have framed a baptism for those that enter into their Synagogue. A fancy too greedily embraced by some christian writers, who would have the holy ordinance of the church’s baptism to be derived from thence.—There are not the least footsteps of any such usage among the Jews, until after the days of John Baptist, in imitation of whom it was first taken up by some anti-mishnical Rabbins.”

Vid. Exerc. on Hebr. Vol. 1. p. 272.

Let the reader judge from the above quotations (which he may be assured are both fair and authentic)—let him judge whether *Candidus* (as our author affects to be called) hath a thousandth part of the modesty of those who had ten thousand times his learning. He will likewise perceive that immersion was so manifestly the primitive mode of baptism, that the most able champions for Pædobaptism have readily acknowledged it, and some of them submitted to the *sprinkling* mode rather as a practice of long custom than divine institution.—O Mayo, Mayo! how I pity thee! ~~for~~ I must pronounce thee guilty either of shameful ignorance, or shameful effrontery! Let me therefore advise thee in future that is before you venture into another fray, to examine carefully (as Horace says)

Quid valeant humeri, quid fere recusent.

F I N I S.











